

I-7
VOLUME XVIII

JULY, 1920

NUMBER 3

The Princeton Theological Review

CONTENTS

Thomas Guthrie	369
CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY	
"Miserable Sinner Christianity" in the Hands of the Rationalists. Article II.	399
B. B. WARFIELD	
The Names of God in the Old Testament	460
ROBERT DICK WILSON	
The Ritschlians and the Preëxistence of Christ	493
JAN KAREL VAN BAALEN	
Reviews of Recent Literature	515
Survey of Periodical Literature	538

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
PRINCETON

LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1920

The Princeton Theological Review

EDITED FOR

THE FACULTY OF PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BY

OSWALD T. ALLIS

Each author is solely responsible for the views expressed in his article
Notice of discontinuance must be sent to the Publishers; otherwise subscriptions will be continued

Subscription \$2.00 a year, 60 cents a copy, for the U. S. A. and Canada

Foreign postage 50 cents additional

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter at Princeton, N. J.

BOOKS REVIEWED

BENTE, F., <i>American Lutheranism, Vol. I.</i>	520
BIEDERWOLF, W. E., <i>The Man God Tried to Kill</i>	533
BOSWORTH, E. I., <i>Commentary on the Epistle of Paul to the Romans</i>	524
BROWN, W. A., <i>New Thoughts on an Old Book</i>	532
CARPENTER, S. C., <i>Christianity According to St. Luke</i>	518
FITCH, A. P., <i>Can the Church Survive in the Changing Order?</i>	515
GILLIES, A., <i>The Individualistic Gospel and other Essays</i>	528
GORDON, A., <i>The Prophetical Literature of the Old Testament</i>	525
HEWITT, C. E., <i>The House of Judah</i>	536
HOUGH, L. H., <i>The Productive Beliefs</i>	531
HUNTER, R., <i>Why We Fail as Christians</i>	529
JEFFERSON, C. E., <i>What the War Has Taught Us</i>	537
JOSEPH, O. L., <i>Freedom and Advance</i>	536
KEYSER, L. S., <i>In the Redeemer's Footsteps</i>	528
MOORE, W. W., <i>A Real Boy Scout</i>	536
MORGAN, G. C., <i>The Ministry of the Word</i>	533
REU, M., <i>How I Tell the Bible Stories to My Sunday School</i>	534
ROBERTSON, J. A., <i>The Gospel and the Epistles of St. John</i>	525
SANDAY, W., <i>Divine Overruling</i>	516
SCHMAUK, T. E., <i>How to Teach in Sunday School</i>	534
SIMPSON, W. J. S., <i>Broad Church Theology</i>	523
SINGER, I., <i>The Rival Philosophies of Jesus and of Paul</i>	519
SLOANE, W. M., <i>The Powers and Aims of Western Democracy</i>	537
<i>The American Jewish Year Book</i>	533
<i>The Presbyterian Handbook</i>	533
WILSON, P. W., <i>The Church We Forget</i>	526

The Princeton Theological Review

JULY, 1920

THOMAS GUTHRIE

Wandering one day down Princes Street in Edinburgh, somewhere between the Scott monument and the National Gallery, and not far from the memorial to Scottish soldiers who fell in the Boer War, I came upon a bronze group of three figures. In the center stood a tall man, massive head and benign countenance. On either side of him, as if taking refuge from a pursuer who would do them harm, crouches a ragged street urchin. In striking contrast with the many memorials on that famous street to Scotland's heroes on the crimson field of war, her philosophers, scientists and poets, this fine statue commemorates the life and ministry of a preacher of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Thomas Guthrie. In the burying ground at the other end of the street there is a statue of Abraham Lincoln erected by Scottish Americans who fought in the Civil War. At the feet of Lincoln cowers a slave; but his fetters have been struck from him, and Lincoln reaches down his great hand to lift the negro to his feet. Both monuments, that to Thomas Guthrie, with the ragged boys about him, and that to Lincoln with the negro at his feet, suggest the greatness that is also goodness. Perhaps the monument to Guthrie makes the deeper appeal; there is less of the formal and grandiose in art about it, and, although it does not always use him well, all the world loves a boy. A fitting memorial, one would say—and not far from the model of the Gospels, where we see little children gathered about the feet of Jesus—for this minister of Christ to have the street Arabs associated with him in the sculptor's creation.

I commence with this account of the Princes Street memorial to Guthrie for the reason that that monument to

Guthrie, his back to those ill-smelling alleys and ugly closes of the 'old town,' bad enough, God knows, even to-day, but fearful in their misery and depravity then, and through which he wandered in search of the vagabond boys, is the best introductory comment upon the homiletic power of the great preacher. To an extraordinary degree for a Scottish preacher, Guthrie was without that taste for metaphysics which characterizes so many of his countrymen. But always it is a great heart that beats in his sermons and a heart that could warm other hearts.

Like Chalmers, Guthrie was the son of a village merchant. He was born at Brechin, Forfarshire, on July 12th, 1803, the youngest but one of thirteen children. His grandfather on his father's side he remembered for the reverent manner in which he approached God in asking the blessing at meals. "When all had taken their seats, and were waiting in solemn silence, he slowly uncovered his hoary locks of the cap he wore in the house; and, slightly throwing back his head, with his open eyes raised to heaven, he implored a blessing on the meal—his voice and uplifted eyes tremulous with age, and his countenance wearing an expression of profound devotion." His bringing up was of the kind which obtained in all well ordered and pious Scotch homes. No luxuries, hard work and study, and a Sabbath of solemnities. There were many fast days too; but to show the difference between a Sabbath and a fast day Guthrie tells us that he and his brothers on the fast day would give vent to one short whistle. His first pedagogue was Jamie Stewart, a weaver by trade. Though but a thoughtless boy Guthrie was struck with the prayers which this old man offered at the meetings of the congregation. "With a remarkable knowledge of his Bible, and perfect mastery of its language, he so interwove its sublimest passages into his prayers that they seemed like the utterance of a seraph before the throne." His first text book was the Book of Proverbs. Confessing to the part this book played in his early education he writes, "The patience, prudence, foresight and economy which used to

characterize Scotchmen—giving occasion to the saying, ‘a canny Scott’—and by which they were so often able to rise in the world and distance all competitors in the race of life, was to a large extent due to their being thus engrained in youth and childhood with the practical wisdom enshrined in the Book of Proverbs.”

The stir of mighty events on the stage of the world’s politics found their echo in the Scottish town. On one occasion, at a watering place on the Fife coast, there were alarms of the French fleet being off the coast. When they rushed to the shore they saw many hundreds of vessels, all under spread of canvas and convoyed by grim men of war. It was not the French fleet, but the West India fleet making under convoy for the Atlantic, north by the Pentland Firth. When the news of Waterloo reached the village every window had its candle illumination.

In 1815, when but a lad of twelve, Guthrie was sent off to Edinburgh to enter the University. He made no great mark as a scholar. “Beyond the departments of fun and fighting, I was no way distinguished at college.” In after years he was thankful that he had gained no decorations or prizes, for the absence of them saved him from any conceit on the ground of scholarship. After four years in the college he commenced at the age of sixteen the four years’ course in theology. When this term was finished he was two years under the age for taking the trials as a preacher. These two years he employed in further study at the University, electing mostly the subjects of natural science. “I lost the metaphysics, but gained the physics, and perhaps, so far as common sense, power of conversation, knowledge of the world, and power of popular address on the platform and in the pulpit, were concerned, that was a good bargain.”

He was licensed by the Presbytery of Brechin in 1825; but no patron of a congregation offering him a congregation, and weary of hanging about home, he set out for Paris. There he spent a year taking lectures at the Sorbonne under

eminent scientists and making the round of the French hospitals. In his journal for that year is the following reference to Charles Hodge: "I then set off for Mark Wilks' service, which is held in a part of the Oratoire. The preacher was a Mr. Hodge, an American professor, who had come to Europe for the purpose of studying the Oriental languages. He intended to do so in Germany, but was at present studying French in Paris, as a medium of communication with the Germans. He was a young-like, intelligent, fair, good-looking, thin, and rather little man; and gave us a capital sermon from the 19th verse of the fifth chapter of I John. The singing was very beautiful. The English sounded most sweetly and pleasantly to my ear." Upon returning to Brechin in 1827, he succeeded one of his brothers as manager of the Bank, making a very successful administrator of its affairs. It was not until 1830 that he was named for the parish of Arbilot. It had been a long apprenticeship that he had served, but the training in science and in business was undoubtedly of great influence upon his mind and helps us to understand his fondness for dealing with facts, objects, the external side of life, and his distaste for metaphysics, and comparative inability to touch the hidden springs of thought.

Arbilot was a parish of a thousand souls on the German Ocean. The manse and the church were in sad disrepair, the snow frequently lying on the rafters of the church when he was preaching, and nothing but an earth floor beneath their feet. The manse was repaired, a new church built, a library and a savings bank started. He made it plain from the beginning that he had come not to seek the honor of this people but to serve them. One of the old wives of the parish, hearing a talk of the new minister's popularity, said, "You are a' speakin' of the fine young man you have just gotten for a minister: but if he is faithful to His Master, be sure he'll have a' the blackguards of the parish on his tap in three weeks!" It was a prophecy which was fulfilled. The members of the parish were intelligent and self-respect-

ing and religious. "There was one Dissenter, a very worthy man, a tailor, who travelled every Sunday, fair weather and foul, ten or twelve miles in order that he might worship with his own sect of Old Light Seceders in Arbroath; there was one man who could not read, but he was an interloper, and not a native; and there was one who did not attend church on the Lord's Day, and he was crazy. The first was much respected; the second was regarded as a curiosity, people pointing him out as the man who could not read; and the third nobody heeded, far less followed his example. On the other hand we had two or three as bad, immoral fellows as were to be found in the whole counrty, yet they were never out of church."

A witness at trials and autopsies, a nurse during epidemics, the lender of books and the keeper of the savings bank, the minister of Arbilot was the friend and the guide of his people, entering into the life of the community in a way which to-day is, unhappily, impossible. For his library he brought from Edinburgh the two volumes of the sermons of Chalmers, and loaned them to his weaver friend, David Gibson. He was astonished when David declined to take the second volume away with him, saying, "Minister, I have no time for him!" "Time!" Guthrie replied, "David, what do you mean?" "You see, sir," answered David, "I got on so slowly; I had to sit with the book in the tae hand and the Dictionar' in the ither; and the warst of it was, I could na find his lang-nebbed words in the Dictionar'!"

In 1830, after his seven years of useful labor at Arbilot, the Town Council of Edinburgh elected him one of the ministers of Old Greyfriars Church. When Guthrie heard that the deputation from the Council was coming down to hear him he tried to cheat them by getting McCosh, afterwards President of Princeton College, and then his nearest neighbor at Arbroath to exchange pulpits with him. McCosh refused to aid him, telling him that leaving Arbilot on that Sabbath to escape the call to Edinburgh would be as bad as Jonah's flight, when ordered to go and preach in Nineveh.

It was a great arena to which Guthrie had come. In a way that was true in no other country, the greatness that was Scotland clustered about the foot of the crag upon which stands the grim old Castle. The chief figure in the Church of Scotland, Dr. Chalmers, was professor of Divinity at the University whither he had come from St. Andrews. Dr. Candlish was at St. George's, and Dr. Cunningham at Trinity. Into this camp of the mighty came the tall, broad shouldered youth of twenty seven years. His own church was one of the historic shrines of Edinburgh and all Scotland, for it was there that, on a Sunday in February, 1638, just two centuries before Guthrie came up from Arbilot to become the minister, the National Covenant was read aloud to the multitude in the Church and in the churchyard. When the reading was finished the Covenant was laid upon the top of one of the flat tombs and the people crowded to sign it, not a few in their enthusiasm opening their veins that they might sign it in their own blood. On the Martyr's Monument in Greyfriars there are only three names of the 18,000 who perished in the days of the Covenant—Argyll's, Renwick's, and James Guthrie's. This James Guthrie was one of the ancestors of the Thomas Guthrie who now came to be minister of the historic church. If great association and the background of history mean anything to a preacher, then Guthrie was peculiarly blessed of fortune in being made the minister of a church whose very stones were redolent of great religious convictions and enthusiasms.

For the important trial that now confronted him Guthrie had for his strength a godly heritage, the faith that dwelt in his fathers, an honorable name, a more than usually long period of university training, residence and study abroad, a business experience, common sense, a knowledge of what is in man, ten years of fruitful ministry at Arbilot, and last, but not least, abounding health. "I have seen him," wrote Dr. McCosh, "in all sorts of situations, and I never saw his soul flat or depressed. In this respect I never knew any

one to be compared with him." That which is first in all notable human endeavor, the natural, was given unstintedly to this preacher. Guthrie was no brooder on the deeper side of life and is not the man to tell us of his own inmost thoughts. We learn little about his deeper religious experience, and judge that his religious life had been a gradual development, with no great crisis in it thrusting the eternities into the foreground. But while at Arbilot he had one serious illness when his life was despaired of and when he himself, expecting to die, exclaimed, "Oh, what would I do without my Saviour now!" This sickness did not leave him with a new theology, as was true in the case of Chalmers, for Guthrie's faith was from the beginning evangelical, but it enlarged his religious horizon and brought the deep note of the eternal into his preaching. It were good if every preacher could, in the first ten years of his ministry, be brought down where the cords of death compassed him and the pains of hell gat hold of him. No atmosphere-clearing experience like it, and no theological tutor to be compared with it!

When he accepted the call to Edinburgh Guthrie made with himself a quiet resolve that if he did not succeed in attracting and holding the people in the metropolis he would not be an incubus to the church there but would go out to America or some of the colonies. But he had not been long at Greyfriars before that resolve faded far into the background, for he at once commanded large congregations, and continued to do so for thirty-four years. There is probably not on record another instance of such a popularity continued without sign or token of diminution for the length of an entire generation. Chalmers was immensely popular, but his pastorates were brief, followed by periods of professorship in St. Andrews and Edinburgh. But for thirty-four years, until his resignation in 1864, Guthrie drew and held the crowds which thronged his churches, Greyfriars and St. John's.

In order to have any sympathetic understanding of the

homiletic spirit and method of Guthrie we must first know him as a pastor and a philanthropist. In a speech delivered in 1838 when he was pleading for the parochial system under the Established Church, Dr. Guthrie said, "I have read of a cave from which the most thoughtless came out sobered and the most talkative silent." To him his change from decent and self-respecting and self-supporting Arbilot to the dens and closes that environed Greyfriars in Edinburgh was like a visit to such a cave. He was appalled, sobered, pained at the degradation which he saw everywhere about him. He felt that he might as well have gone to be a missionary among the Hindoos on the banks of the Ganges. Some years before, Dr. Chalmers had embarked upon his enterprise of the evangelization of the masses, "excavating the heathen," as he calls it, by putting into operation his parochial system. The aim of this system was to reach and raise the submerged population of the great centers by building more churches and schools and by a thorough system of pastoral visitation and instruction. When he came to Edinburgh Guthrie determined to follow the same plan and make an heroic assault upon the vice and misery and destitution, physical and moral, which confronted him wherever he turned.

One of the best examples of his descriptive power is that passage in "Out of Harness" where he describes his meeting with Chalmers shortly after his coming to Edinburgh:

"It was there where one looks down on the street below, and on the foul, crowded closes that stretch like ribs down into the Cowgate, I stood on a gloomy day in the fall of the year '37. The streets were a puddle; the heavy air, loaded with smoke, was thick and murky; right below lay the narrow street of dingy tenements, whose toppling chimneys and patched and battered roofs were fit emblems of the fortunes of most of their tenants. Of these, some were lying over the sills of windows innocent of glass, or stuffed with old hats and dirty rags; others, coarse-looking women, with squalid children in their arms or at their feet, stood in groups at the close mouths—here with empty laughter, chaffing any passing acquaintance, there screaming with

each other in a drunken brawl, or standing sullen and silent, with hunger and ill usage in their saddened looks. A brewer's cart, threatening to crush beneath its ponderous wheels the ragged urchins who had no other playground, rumbled over the cause-way, drowning the quavering voice of one whose drooping head and scanty dress were in ill harmony with song, but not drowning the shrill pipe of an Irish girl, who thumped the back of an unlucky donkey, and cried her herrings at 'three a penny.' So looked the parish I had come to cultivate; and while contrasting the scene below with pleasant recollections of the parish I had just left—its singing larks, daisied pastures, decent peasants, and the grand blue sea rolling its lines of snowy breakers on the shore, my rather sad and sombre ruminations were suddenly checked. A hand was laid on my shoulder. I turned around to find Dr. Chalmers at my elbow. This good and great man knew that I had accepted an Edinburgh charge mainly for the purpose of trying what the parochial or territorial system, fairly wrought, could do towards Christianizing the heathendom beneath our feet, and restoring the denizens of the Cowgate and its closes to sober decent and church going habits. Contemplating the scene for a little in silence, all at once, with his broad Luther-like face glowing with enthusiasm, he waved his arm to exclaim, 'A beautiful field, sir; a very fine field of operation!'

Guthrie found his church filled with well dressed people who contrasted strangely with the population of his parish. His resolve was to come into close contact with the poor. In order to do this and to have more freedom in carrying out his plans Guthrie had built for him a new church, St. John's in the Nether-Bow, and to which he removed in 1840. The gallery of this church was let to applicants from all parts of the city; but six hundred and fifty sittings—the whole area of the church—were reserved as free seats for residents in the parish, poor or rich, who applied for them. He had fifteen deacons and thirty elders, each with his particular portion of the parish to look after the people, seeking out the non-churchgoers, of whom Edinburgh, not a large city, had more than fifty thousand, and bringing the children into the schools. Describing the work he was starting at St. John's Guthrie writes to a friend, "We are

abundantly filled with people, and you would be delighted to see the masses of common people who cram every corner and nook of the area." It was an inspiring example that the two most popular preachers of Great Britain set when both of them, Chalmers in Glasgow and Guthrie in Edinburgh, relinquished churches that had history and prestige and the patronage of the well-to-do, and went out to build churches for the common people, each determining in his heart that the prophetic and the New Testament apology for Christ's religion, that the *poor* have the gospel preached unto *them*, should again have a meaning in the church and with the people. The church to-day, as always, has many needs; but probably that is one of our greatest needs, the earnest and unquestioned desire and ambition on the part of our ministers to have the privilege of preaching the Gospel unto the poor. Unfortunately, not always through their own inclination, the tendency is for men of outstanding ability in the ministry to remove themselves from all contact with the poor.

In his unflagging efforts to 'throw a zone of mercy' around his miserable parish Guthrie was indefatigable in his work as a pastor. There is a story of an earlier minister in Edinburgh whose parish embraced a very degraded population. Once a year this minister approached the mouth of each 'close' in his district. Into their darkness and stench and squalor and immorality he never penetrated, but uncovering his head and lifting a gloved hand, he invoked the Divine blessing to rest on "all the inhabitants, young and old, of this close." This pious duty done he went his way and left the close to itself for another year. But Guthrie was not that kind of a pastor. Every day of the week, like Thomas Chalmers, he could be found exploring these darksome dens in which the people of his parish lived and sinned and suffered and died. As an instance of the minute care of his pastoral visitation the following jottings from his note-book will serve: "Taylor's land—Mother, 48—very delicate; sober; often not able to work, splitting wood. Anne

10, Mary 8, shake down; pawned gown to help rent; also shift, petticoat of mother's, two frocks of girls'; bonnet of her own; cut-down bedstead to sell; all to buy food." Often he said that he came home to his table at night so sickened by what he had seen that he could hardly partake of its plenty. This page torn from his pastoral notebook would not be remarkable if taken from the notebook of a parish worker or deaconess or city missionary; but it is remarkable, and to be considered by all who would be true ministers of Jesus Christ, because it is a page from the notebook of the most popular preacher of Scotland and of the whole world. To him humanity, however coarsened, sunken, debauched and enslaved, was ever the sacred thing, that for which all his work was done. He looked upon the multitude as sheep having no shepherd and was moved with compassion. It was that compassion which helped to make the great preacher. His sermons have an undertone of humanity's sorrows in them.

In these daily invasions of the haunts of sin and misery the thing that most touched Guthrie was the condition of the children. In 1841, on a visit to Anstruther, the birth-place of Chalmers, he saw a painting of a cobbler's shop. On his stool sat the cobbler, spectacles on his nose, an old shoe on his knees, massive forehead and firm mouth and eyes that beamed with benevolence. Around the cobbler, sitting or standing, was a group of children, all busy at their lessons. It was a representation of John Pounds, the Portsmouth cobbler who had taken pity on the "ragged children whom magistrates and ministers, ladies and gentlemen, were leaving to run wild, and go to ruin on their streets." Looking upon the picture Guthrie felt humiliated, ashamed of himself, and resolved to bestir himself to do more for little children. A second incident which turned his heart and mind in the direction of the destitute children was a midnight visit to the police station where he saw the homeless waifs seeking shelter for the night. On one open space before a stove, where the light shone full on his face, lay

a poor child who attracted his special attention. "He was miserably clad; he seemed about eight years old; he had the sweetest face I ever saw; his bed was the pavement, his pillow a brick, and as he lay calm in sleep, forgetful of all his sorrows, he might have served for a picture of injured innocence. He knew neither father nor mother, brothers nor friends; in the wide world his only friends were the police; how he lived they did not know; but there he was at night. I could not get that boy out of my mind or heart for days and nights together. I have often regretted that some effort was not made to save him. Before now, launched on the sea of passions and exposed to a thousand temptations, he has, too probably, become a melancholy wreck; left by a society, more criminal than he, to become a criminal, and then punished for his fate, not his fault."

Such were the scenes which touched the heart of Guthrie and made him resolve to do something for the saving of the children. Encouraged by the example of Sheriff Watson who in 1841 had started a Ragged School in Aberdeen, Guthrie published in 1847 his "Plea for Ragged Schools," hardly daring to think that his plea would meet with a favorable response. But it proved to be the word spoken in season. Almost every newspaper published extracts from the Plea, and in a few weeks he had secured contributions amounting to £700. Lord Jeffrey sent him a contribution of £50, and in his letter said, "I have long considered you and Dr. Chalmers as the two greatest benefactors of your age and country, and admired and envied you beyond all your contemporaries, though far less for your extraordinary genius and eloquence, than for the noble uses to which you have devoted these gifts, and the good you have done with the use of them. In all these respects, this last effort of yours is perhaps the most remarkable and important; and among the many thousand hearts that have swelled and melted over these wakening pages, I think I may say that none has been more deeply touched than my own." This letter to Guthrie reminds one of the noble letter Jeffrey

wrote to Dickens after he had sobbed and cried over No. 5 of *Dombey and Son*. It takes the pathos of childhood to open the door into the inmost of man's heart.

The object of these Ragged Schools was in brief as follows: To reclaim the neglected and profligate children of Edinburgh by giving them food for their daily support, instruction in reading, writing and arithmetic, industrial training, and last, but not least, by teaching them the truths of the Gospel. An association was formed, embracing all opinions and creeds and by the end of 1847 three schools had been opened, one for boys, another for girls, and a third for children of both sexes under ten years of age, with a total attendance of two hundred and sixty-five children. A dispute soon arose over the question of Roman Catholic children and the teaching of the Bible, a so-called "liberal" group maintaining that the teaching of the Bible should be dispensed with. But Guthrie insisted upon the Bible and the whole Bible. He protested that it was an abuse of words to consider the children he had gathered in these schools as either Roman Catholic or Protestant, declaring that they were outcasts, regardless of all religion—without even the profession of any. Dearly as he loved the Ragged Schools he said he would rather see them perish if they could be maintained only by parting with the Bible. The record of the city jails soon showed in eloquent and irrefutable evidence the effect of these schools upon the juvenile life of the city. In 1847 five percent of the prison population were under fourteen years of age. In 1851 the proportion had fallen to less than one percent. The connection of Dr. Guthrie with these Ragged Schools brought him into great prominence as a philanthropist and his counsel was often sought by statesmen, reformers, and legislators. No work was dearer to his heart than this enterprise he had started in behalf of the forsaken and abandoned children. "I have never engaged in a cause," he said at a conference in Birmingham, "as a man and a Christian minister that I believe on my death bed I will look back on with more

pleasure or gratitude to God, than that He led me to work for Ragged Schools. I have the satisfaction, when I lay my head upon my pillow, of always finding one soft part of it: and that is, that God has made me an instrument in His hand by saving many a poor creature from a life of misery and crime." The beautiful monument yonder on Princes Street, with the "city Arabs"—and it was Guthrie who brought that expression into our vocabulary—taking refuge under his arms, is the best possible memorial to the great preacher who saw the multitude of little children as sheep without a shepherd and was moved with compassion. Like most celebrated preachers Guthrie quoted hardly at all, and almost never did he quote poetry. But there was one bit of verse that he did use occasionally, and which he called "My Favorite Motto"—and a good motto too, for all preachers of the message of the compassionate Christ—

I live for those that love me,
For those who know me true,
For the heaven that smiles above me,
And waits my coming too;
For the cause that needs assistance,
For the wrongs that need resistance,
For the future in the distance,
For the good that I can do.

When we attempt to separate Guthrie the preacher from Guthrie the pastor and philanthropist, and begin to examine his sermons as things by themselves, what strikes one is a feeling of wonder that sermons displaying so little freshness of idea or sequence of logic or power of demonstration could have held spellbound for more than a generation the vast throngs who heard them. But that very straightforwardness, obviousness and normality are not without their suggestion, reminding the preacher that to be brilliant or unique is not a necessary condition of great preaching. Men speak of Robertson of Brighton as the "preacher's preacher" because his sermons are so homiletically suggestive, turning a truth over and over for us, letting flashes of light play now here and now there. There is none of that delight to

be experienced in the reading of Guthrie's sermons. He sticks to the great Biblical and doctrinal themes, and generally his proposition is clearly stated in the text itself. His method is strictly topical, like all masters of the homiletic art, never wearying his hearers with cross references, or telling them what the writer had been saying on a previous chapter, or what some other writer had said on a similar subject, but taking up at once the main idea of the text. Occasionally the textual relationship to the sermon is indirect—the method that has become so popular and is so abused by preachers to-day—as when in the sermon “The World a Lie,” his text is “Thy calf, O Samaria, hast cast thee off,” his purpose being to show the unsatisfactoriness of the pleasures of the world; or when he takes the lament of David over Jonathan, “Thy love unto me was wonderful” as the text for a sermon on “The Love of Christ.” But as a rule, he selects for his text one that contains, without need of change of time or circumstance or characters, the propositions of the sermon, as the sermon on “The Christian's Strength,” from the text, “Wait on the Lord, be of good courage, and he shall strengthen thee” (Ps. xxvii. 14) or on “The Fullness of Christ,” from the text, “It pleased the Father that in Him all fullness should dwell.” His texts never startle, surprise, or create even a legitimate curiosity.

Guthrie was a firm believer in the theory and practice of Paley who once wrote—to students for the ministry, “Disdain not the old fashion of dividing your sermon into heads; a discourse which rejects these aids to perspicuity will turn out a bewildering rhapsody, without aim or effect, order or conclusion.”

As for the outlines of his sermon they recall Newman Hall's comment, quoting what had been said of the sermon preached by a Welsh preacher, “There was nothing peculiar in the sermon—old bones.” So one says to oneself turning over the pages of Guthrie's sermons, Old bones indeed! bones that generations of preachers have carefully picked

over. The outlines are just what a teacher of homiletics would get from a middler or a senior class. Here are a few examples :

On "Temptation," from the text of James i. 13-15, "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God." I. The importance of the subject. II. The source of temptation is not in God. III. The source of temptation is in ourselves. IV. Our corrupt nature acted on by temptation is the source of sin. V. The end of sin is death.

Or this on "The Love of Christ," "Thy love to me was wonderful," II Sam. i. 26. I. Because there was nothing in us lovely. II. Because there was nothing in us loving. III. This love is wonderful in its expression.

Or this on "The Reconciler," "Having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself," Col. i. 20. I. By nature man is at enmity with God. II. God desires to be reconciled to his enemies. III. To make our peace with God Jesus laid down his life.

Ordinary, commonplace, obvious, you say. Yet the themes of the sermons and the divisions of them are the clear and plain statement of the great facts of the Christian religion. Guthrie never, unconsciously or by effort, gives a unique or unusual statement of any Christian truth. He takes the familiar truths, the great commonplaces of the Christian revelation, and speaks about them in a way that everybody understands. He would be called platitudinous, by those, who, in their effort to escape the ordinary and familiar, sometimes get away from the Gospel altogether. But platitudinous or not, Guthrie is always sensible and reasonable. His platform may be evident and ordinary, but it is broad and substantial.

As you read the sermons, or in imagination listen to the preacher, you discover too that there is a man talking who knows and understands the average man. It is to that average man that he is addressing himself. The listener that your mind pictures waiting upon these sermons is not the philosopher or metaphysician or mystic dreamer, but

the average man and the average woman. There were indeed plenty of poets and statesmen and philosophers who came to hear him, but always it is the average man who is being spoken to in these sermons. You feel that they are being addressed by a sensible man who takes for granted certain common facts of human nature. So it is that these very traits which make Guthrie, of all the great preachers the most intolerable to read—the plain straightforward texts, and obvious divisions of the theme, and undisguised and easily comprehended comments upon God, the Bible, life and destiny—were also his strength as an oral preacher.

When we turn from the bones of the sermons and their observations to their color, fragrance and tone, it is an altogether different matter. Now we come upon Guthrie the painter, the story teller, the illustrator. When he lay upon his deathbed at St. Leonard's he took up a mirror and examined his face, saying that he was doing as the sailor did who climbed to the masthead to try if he could see land. And when his sight began to fail him he likened it to land birds alighting on the mast and letting the weary mariner know that he was near to the desired haven. Keep in mind those two scenes, Guthrie with the ragged children taking refuge under his arms, and Guthrie on his deathbed, with the mirror in his hand likening himself to the sailor on the masthead, and you have before you the two chief characteristics and excellencies of his preaching—his compassion and his power of illustration.

The gift, of course, must have been in him from the beginning, else he could not have painted as he did. But the peculiar thing about the illustrative style of Guthrie is that it was consciously and deliberately acquired. His first sermons showed little or nothing of the pictorial style which afterwards made him famous. His assumption of the anecdotal and illustrative method was due to the discovery made at Arbilot that the portions of his sermons which 'stuck' were the illustrations. Instead of the usual second service he inaugurated at Arbilot a Sunday evening class

for the young people. At this class he catechised the young men and young women and went over with them the sermon of the morning. He was surprised and humiliated to discover how little of his carefully prepared sermon he could get from them. To aid them he set forth the topics of the sermon by illustrations drawn from nature, history, the world. This illustrative practice, and the fact that what they did remember of any sermon was the story or the illustration, and his own increasing ability to use illustrations, caused him to change his whole manner of preaching. Describing the change Dr. McCosh says of him, "He made shrewd practical remarks, told anecdotes of what he had seen and heard, and used illustrations from country life and scenes in which the people were interested." I shall let Guthrie tell his own story:

"When I went to Arbilot, I knew pretty well how to speak sermons, but very little about how to compose them; so I set myself vigorously to study how to illustrate the great truths of the gospel, and enforce them, so that there should be no sleepers in the church, no wandering eyes, but everywhere an eager attention. Savingly to convert my hearers was not within my power; but to command their attention, to awaken their interest, to instruct their minds was—and I determined to do it.

"With this end, I used the simplest, plainest terms, avoiding anything vulgar, but always, where possible, employing the Saxon tongue, the mother tongue of my hearers. I studied the style of the addresses which the ancient and inspired prophets delivered to the people of Israel, and saw how, differing from dry disquisitions or a naked statement of truths, they abounded in metaphors, figures and illustrations. I turned to the Gospels and found that He who knew what was in man, what could best illuminate a subject, win the attention and move the heart, used parables or illustrations, stories, comparisons, drawn from the scenes of nature and familiar life, to a large extent in His teaching; in regard to which a woman—type of the masses—said, 'The parts of the Bible that I like best are the likes.'

"Taught by such models, and encouraged in my resolution by such authorities, I resolved to follow, though it should be at a vast distance, these ancient masters of the art of preaching; being all the more ready to do so, as it

would be in harmony with the natural turn and bent of my own mind.

"I was careful to observe by the faces of my hearers and also by the account the more intelligent of my Sunday evening class gave of my discourses, the style and character of those parts which had made the deepest impression, that I might cultivate it.

"After my discourse was written, I spent hours in correcting it; latterly always for that purpose keeping a blank page on my manuscript opposite a written one, cutting out dry bits, giving point to dull ones, making clear any obscurity, and narrative parts more graphic, throwing more pathos into appeals, and copying God in His works by adding the ornamental to the useful. The longer I have lived and composed, I have acted more and more according to the saying of Sir Joshua Reynolds in his 'Lectures on Painting,' that God does not give excellence to men but as the reward of labour.

"To this, with my style of delivery, and self possession, and command and flexibility of voice, and power of throwing myself into the characters I was depicting,—and feeling their emotions, and expressing them in such language, and looks, and tones as they would themselves have done, I attribute the 'popularity' which I early gained and maintained for well nigh forty years of a public ministry."

For the groundwork of his preaching Guthrie had the rugged and grand doctrines of the Christian religion. He was no metaphysician, keen in speculative thought, nor was he a deep searcher of the things of the inner life of the soul, but the solid foundations of the Christian revelation were always underneath him, and he never committed the blunder that makes all great preaching impossible, that is, dealing only with the low themes of prudential ethics. He may not have been a mystic or a speculative seer, but he never descended to the low platform of a mere moralist, and the redemptive truths of Christianity are always in the background. With this went his shrewd common sense and his wide knowledge of men. "Great masses of practical wisdom came out. People did not say, but they felt 'that man knows what is in my heart; he speaks to my experience, to what I have passed through; he knows my labors and my

troubles, and I feel that I can trust him and take him as my adviser.' ”

In his dealing with the familiar ground of Christian doctrine Guthrie went on the correct theory that out of the heart are the issues of religion and life. He preached to the common sense of men, but also to the common heart of men. He knew that men had hearts, emotions, and he sought in every way to make the chords of the heart vibrate. It was probably this legitimate appeal to the heart that made Guthrie, in spite of the fact that he was not a deep expounder of Scripture nor a close reasoner, a favorite preacher for intellectual men like Hugh Miller, Lord Cockburn, and many others. Lord Cockburn, asked one morning where he was going to church, answered, “Oh, I’m going to hae a greet with Guthrie.” Dr. McCosh speaks of the crowds that would flock to hear him when he came to Arbroath to preach on a summer evening and thus comments on the emotional quality of his preaching: “Some hard men thought of him that his discourses were not very logical; some finical men and women regarded his Forfarshire pronounciation as very broad and his illustrations rather vivid; but they all went to hear him, because they got their hearts warmed.”

Guthrie wisely chose to dwell more in his sermons upon the dramatic and tragic side of life, and his power to move the feelings had full opportunity for exhibition as he described the miseries of the destitute in the city’s darksome dens, the perils of the shipwrecked, and the emotions of men in any of the tense moments of life. When he was called to Edinburgh a number of his co-presbyters gathered about him and said, “Mr. Guthrie, you must change your style of preaching when you have to appear before an audience so polished as that of Edinburgh.” His friend McCosh heard of this silly counsel and implored him not to alter his mode of speaking, assuring him that human nature is much the same everywhere, and that what had moved the people of Arbilot and Arbroath would also move the people of Edinburgh.” No greater absurdity was ever put forth

than to say of this or that acceptable preacher that the qualities which endear him to one class of hearers will not appeal to those of a different class as well. In the great depths men are all the same, and he who can speak to the heart that is in man, can reach and interest any class of men. Guthrie tells us:

“In view of going to Edinburgh I had resolved to adhere to the same style of preaching which seemed to make me popular and acceptable at Arbilot, concluding that, as God had fashioned all men’s hearts alike, human nature was the same in the town as in the country—in ladies and gentlemen as in lads and lassies. There were not two Gospels; and I knew from the example of our Saviour’s discourses that the highest taste might be gratified by one of whom it might be said, ‘the common people heard him gladly.’ I had read how ministers who were popular in the country, lost all their attractions and failed when they were taken to Edinburgh. Fancying that they must adopt there a superior and more intellectual style of preaching, they abandoned their natural and efficient for a stiff and stilted manner. On this, which has proved to many a rock ahead, I resolved not to make shipwreck; while, at the same time, I resolved to spare no pains, nor toil nor time in careful preparation, in making my descriptions graphic, my statements lucid, my appeals pathetic, in filling my discourses, in fact, with what would both strike and stick.”

Charles Wolfe, the celebrated author of those perfect lines, “The Burial of Sir John Moore,” was also a preacher of unusual originality and poetic charm. He left behind him some very helpful suggestions to preachers. Among these hints is the following: “Bring in familiar topics. Begin naturally and easily, but so as to excite curiosity—with an incident or anecdote. Begin in an original and striking but sedate manner.” Thomas Guthrie’s sermons are splendid examples of introductions which are sedate, but striking and original, and which excite curiosity.

In this effort to make things strike and stick the introductions to his sermons afford an interesting study. He seems determined to say that which will at once strike the mind and eye of the hearer, rather than commence indifferently, contextually, platitudinously, and then slowly

"work up." He regarded that first paragraph as one of the most important portions of his sermons, and in many of his sermons it must be confessed that, so far as the reading of the sermons is concerned, the introductions are the most interesting part. The introduction in its remoteness, and his hearers must have been at a loss to see what he would be at, often excited curiosity; but regardless of any connection with the main theme, the introduction itself was worth listening to. Anecdotes of war, shipwreck, biographical notes, storms, descriptions of the work of man or the work of nature, these are the doors through which we enter the sermons of Guthrie. Almost any sermon that you turn to is an example of this method of introduction. Let me recall a number of them. In the sermon on "I the Lord have spoken it," or the "Security of the Believer," he commences thus:

"When on a sultry summer day the sky gets overcast, and angry clouds gather thick upon its brow, and bush and brake are silent, and the very cattle, like human beings, draw close together, standing dumb in their untasted pastures, and while there is no ripple on the lake, nor leaf stirring on the tree, all nature seems struck with awe, and stands in trembling expectation; then, when the explosion comes, and a blinding stream of fire leaps from the cloud, and as if heaven's riven vault were tumbling down upon our head, the thunders crash, peal, roar along the sky, he has neither poetry nor piety nor sense, who does not reverently bow his head and assent to the words of David, 'The voice of the Lord is full of majesty.'"

The purpose of this description of the majesty of God's voice in the storm is to prepare the way for showing a yet greater majesty which the ear of faith hears when God declares His promises to His people. Another good example of this kind of introduction is that to the sermon "In Trial," on the text, "Count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations" (St. James i. 2):

"There is an old story of two knights who fell into a quarrel, almost into a combat, about a shield—the one asserting, and prepared with sword to maintain, that the shield

was made of gold; the other as positively asserting that it was not gold but silver. Both were right; and there was no more occasion for quarrel between them than there has often been between good men in religious controversy. Looking at a doctrine from different points of view, not having the same standpoint, as it is called, they quarreled, and the quarrel was a mistake."

All this was to open the way for a discussion about the two meanings of the word temptation. In the sermon on "God's Motive in Salvation"—"I do this for mine holy name's sake," (Ezekiel xxvi. 22), Guthrie begins with a long account of the river Nile, its sources, its irrigation of the desert, its monunments and empires, and then turns to the river of the Gospel as it has flowed down through the ages. In the sermon on "The Kingdom of Christ"—"Translated into the Kingdom of His dear Son"—he begins with a description of the crown jewels of Scotland in the Castle. Vulgar curiosity sees nothing but gems and sword and sceptre, and the multitude go away to talk of their value or their beauty. But the eyes of a patriot sees more than that:

"He looks with deep and meditative interest on that rim of gold, not for its intrinsic value, but because it once encircled the brow of Scotland's greatest king,—the hero of her independence, Robert the Bruce. His fancy sees a nations in arms. Now he hears the shout of Bannockburn, and now, the long wail of Flodden. The events of centuries, passed in weary war, roll by before her. The red flames burst from lonely fortalice and busy town; the smiling vale, with its happy homesteads, lies desolate; scaffolds reek with the blood of patriots; courage grapples with despair. It is the interests that were at stake, the fight for liberty, the good blood shed, it is these, not the jewels, which in a patriot's eye make that a costly crown—a relic of the olden time, worthy of a nation's pride and jealous preservation."

One of the finest pieces of description to be met with in the sermons of Guthrie, indeed, one of the noblest passages in modern homilies, is the introduction to his sermon on "The Sins and Sorrows of the City"—"When he beheld the city, he wept over it" (Luke xix:41), where he likens the

submerged forests of the ocean pavement to the submerged masses of the city, the physical subsidence with the moral:

"There is a remarkable phenomenon to be seen on certain parts of our coast. Strange to say, it proves, notwithstanding such expressions as "the stable and solid land," that it is not the land but the sea which is the stable element. On some summer day when there is not a wave to rock her, nor breath of wind to fill her sail or fan a cheek, you launch your boat upon the waters, and, pulling out beyond lowest tide-mark, you idly lie upon her bows to catch the silvery glance of a passing fish, or watch the movements of the many curious creatures that travel the sea's sandy bed, or creeping out of their rocky homes, wander its tangled mazes. If the traveller is surprised to find a deep sea shell imbedded in the marbles of a mountain peak, how great is your surprise to see beneath you a vegetation foreign to the deep! Below your boat, submerged many feet beneath the surface of the lowest tide, away down in those green crystal depths, you see no rusting anchor, no mouldering remains of some shipwrecked one, but in the standing stumps of trees the mouldering vestiges of a forest, where once the wild cat prowled, and the birds of heaven, singing their loves, had nestled and nursed their young. In counterpart to those portions of our coast where sea hollowed caves, with sides the waves have polished, and floors still strewn with shells and sand, now stand high above the level of the strongest stream-tides, there stand these dead, decaying trees,—entombed in the deep. A strange phenomenon, which admits of no other explanation than this, that there the coast line has sunk beneath its ancient level.

"Many of our cities present a phenomenon as melancholy to the eye of a philanthropist, as the other is interesting to a philosopher, or geologist. In their economical, educational, moral and religious aspects, certain parts of the city bear palpable evidence of a corresponding subsidence. Not a single house, nor a block of houses, but whole streets, once from end to end the homes of decency and industry, and wealth and rank and piety, have been engulfed. A flood of ignorance and sin now breaks and roars above the tops of their highest tenements. Nor do the old stumps of a forest, still standing up erect beneath the sea wave, indicate a greater change, a deeper subsidence than the relics of ancient grandeur, and the touching memorials of piety which yet

linger about those wretched dwellings, like the evening twilight on the hills, like some trace of beauty on a corpse."

In the sermon on "Trial" Guthrie employs 27 illustrations. Of these 10 are from the Bible, 2 from history, 1 from literature, 1 from personal experience, 5 from nature, 6 from common life and occupations, and 1 from poetry. Let us take up the volume of sermons, *The Gospel in Ezekiel*, and note the illustrations in the first sermon that comes under our eye. It happens to be the sermon "Man Justified," "Then will I sprinkle, clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean" (Ezekiel xxvi. 25). Our examination yields the following result: 24 illustrations, including similes and metaphors, are employed. Listening to these illustrations this is what the man in Guthrie's church would have seen before the sermon was over: Martha cumbered with care in serving the supper to Jesus; the woodbine and the ivy embracing the tree with their arms; bubbles colored with rainbow hues and bursting at the touch; a man stretched on the bed of death; a river flowing through the meadow and reflecting in its bosom the heavens above; the old covenant of Eden, "Do this and live"; the Nile and the Ganges with their many mouths into the sea; a tree dividing itself into two great branches, or trunks; the door of heaven guarded like the gate of a treasure house or a citadel with two iron bolts; the Scottish emigrants in America carrying their superstitions with them and seeing the fairies dance upon the green; Lazarus coming out of his grave; Guthrie baptizing a dying infant as it lay on the expiring mother's breast, to the baptism of the church being added the baptism of the father's tears; the extent, origin and uses of water; the lost traveller on the reeling desert, with bloodshot eyes, and his throat as black as dust; the red heifer of Old Testament ceremonial; two men starting off in opposite directions and meeting each other on the opposite side of the globe; the hunter, like the devil, or the minister who tries to hide hell, spreading a covering over the pit for the game. What a panorama it has been! There were no moving pictures in

those days, but those who listened to Guthrie preach saw the passing show of life in all parts of the world and in all ages of the world.

Most of the illustrative parts of Guthrie's sermons are elaborated descriptions; but now and then there is the flash of a clause or a sentence which lights up the whole scene for us, as when he refers to Joshua and how he "stopped the glowing axles of the sun," or how Christ "threw a zone of mercy around the world"; or where, wishing to illustrate the soul's longing for heaven he describes a Scotchman or an Englishman, exiled in the tropics: "Where the palm tree waves its graceful plumes, and birds of jeweled lustre flash and flicker among gorgeous flowers, the exile sits staring upon vacancy; a far away home lies on his heart; and borne on the wings of fancy over intervening seas and lands, he has swept away home, and hears the lark singing above his father's fields, and sees his fair haired brother, with light foot and childhood's glee, chasing the butterfly by his native stream. And in his best hours, home, his own sinless home—a home with his father above that starry sky—will be the wish of every Christian man."

To the preacher who is discouraged by reading the sermons of a man like Guthrie and feels that all this is the work of genius, and that try as he may he can do but poorly, it will be reassuring and stimulating to know that these sermons were not struck off in the heat of the moment in the study, nor created in the excitement of the pulpit, but carefully, almost painfully worked out. He had great powers of improvisation and no readier speaker ever went upon a platform or into a pulpit, and his discourses had all the appearance of extempore addresses. But that was because of the thoroughness with which he had done his work. He wrote every line and carefully committed the sermon to memory. If, in memorizing the sermon, he came upon a passage that was difficult to hold in the memory he rewrote it, believing that what he could not recall easily was not clearly stated. He vocalized his sermons as he wrote them,

but was careful not to vocalize as he memorized, lest the sermon should become stale, and ever kept the congregation before him, so that the sermon when finished was not a meditation, or essay, or speculation, but a sermon, an address to men and women upon the subject of gravest import. So McCosh bears witness: "During all the seven years he was at Arbilot, I believe he never entered the pulpit without having his discourse written and committed. Had he acted in any other way, he might have been left in Arbilot all his life, greatly esteemed, no doubt, in the district, but without ever occupying the wide sphere which God opened to him. Even in writing he kept an audience before his mind's eye, and he prepared not an abstract essay, but an address to be spoken to men and women, to young men and maidens. I have often found him on the Saturday night amending and correcting what he had written, and filling his mind with the subject. His illustrative style made his discourse more easily remembered by himself, as it was more easily remembered by his audience."

We have noted the deliberate plan of Guthrie to preach pictorially. He used to speak of the three chief rules of preaching as the "Three P's"—Painting, Proving, and Persuading. With him the whole emphasis was on the painting. We have noted also the painstaking method of preparation. He counted on eighteen hours each week for his sermon preparation, from six to nine in the morning each day. "A practice this, I would recommend to all ministers, whether in town or country. It secures ample time for pulpit preparation, brings a man fresh every day to his allotted portion of work, keeps his sermon simmering in his mind all the week through, till the subject takes entire possession of him, and as the consequence, he comes on Sunday to the pulpit to preach with fullness, feeling and power."

As for the man and his manner in action in the pulpit a few witnesses will suffice—

Dr. McCosh:

"At this moment I see him before me on the pulpit.

He was tall, six feet two, bony and somewhat gaunt. His voice was loud but mellow; he could modulate it well, and at times it became low and pathetic."

Lord Cockburn:

"Practical and natural; passionate without vehemence; with perfect self possession, and always generous and devoted, he is a very powerful preacher. His language and accent are very Scotch, but nothing can be less vulgar, and his gesture, which seems as unthought about as a child's, is the most graceful I have ever seen in any public speaker. He deals in the broad expository Ovidian page, and is comprehended and felt by the poor woman on the steps of the pulpit as thoroughly as by the strangers who are attracted solely by his eloquence. Everything he does glows with a frank, gallant warmheartedness rendered more delightful by a boyish simplicity of air and style."

He had before him a single sheet of paper with the heads of the sermon written on it. His manner was easy and voice strong, but not roaring. "The more easy your manner, without losing the character of seriousness and solemnity, so much the better. Vigor and birr, without roaring and bellowing, are ever to be aimed at." Guthrie always had the inspiration of an eager throng as he preached. Some who could not gain admission to the church used to sit on the roof, near the ventilators, where they could hear, though they saw not.

Another hearer says of him:

"He had all the external attractions of a pulpit orator; an unusually tall and commanding person, with an abundance of easy and powerful, because natural, gesture; a quickly and strongly expressive countenance, which age rendered finer as well as more comely (for in early and middle manhood it was gaunt, with a dusky complexion, overshadowed by lank black hair); a powerful, clear and musical voice, the intonations of which were varied and appropriate, managed with an actor's skill, though there was not the least appearance of art."

It is interesting to see how similar are the anecdotes of the effects of the sermons of celebrated preachers. This of

Guthrie, told by an eye witness, the Rev. George Hay, has an apocryphal note to it, but there seems to be no good reason for doubting it:

“During one of Dr. Guthrie’s powerful appeals to the unbeliever to close with the free offer of salvation through Jesus Christ, he described a shipwreck and the launching of the lifeboat to save the perishing crew in such vivid colors, that the dreadful scene appeared actually to take place before our eyes. Captain C—, a young naval officer, who was sitting in a front seat of the gallery, was so electrified that he seemed to lose all consciousness of what was around him. I saw him spring to his feet, and begin to take off his coat, when his mother took hold of him and pulled him down.”

In 1867, three years after he gave up his preaching in Edinburgh, Dr. Guthrie, in company with Principal Fairbairn and Mr. Wells, sailed for America for a visitation of the churches there. By the time the ship reached Queens-town Guthrie was in such distress that he abandoned the voyage. A friend meeting him in Edinburgh shortly after said with surprise, “Why, doctor, I thought you had gone to the New World?” “Ah,” replied Guthrie, “had I not left the ship at Queenstown, it would have been, not the New World but the ‘other’ world.”

In his discourse at the funeral of Guthrie Dr. Candlish said, “Men of talents, men of abilities, men of learning, are not uncommon. Men powerful in thought and speech are often raised up. But genius, real poetic genius like Guthrie’s, comes but once in many generations. We shall not look upon his like soon, if ever.” Despite the verdict of this distinguished contemporary the student of Guthrie reaches the conclusion that he was a man of marked talent, rather than a man of genius. His carefully planned preparation for the pulpit in no way indicates a man of genius, such as Beecher certainly was. There was a gift of fancy and illustration, and a glowing sympathy and compassion. But the fire of genius, so far as the matter is concerned, was not there. It is as a man of talent that Guthrie is an encourage-

ment and suggestion to his fellow preachers. His career was based on loyalty to the Christian revelation, wide knowledge of men, common sense, good education, a reasonable degree of talent, tireless industry and a definite plan in preaching. He determined to make familiar Christian truths "strike and stick" by reason of the way in which he illustrated them. He succeeded.

He had hoped to have a quick translation like Chalmers, but his last battle was long and desperate. He who had described so many deathbed scenes now learned that he had told only half the truth: "I have often seen death beds. I have often described them; but I had no conception until now what hard work dying really is. Ah, my dear children, you see I am now as helpless in your arms as you ever were in mine." Near the end he asked his family to sing, and being asked what he would like, answered, "Give me a bairn's hymn." Thus, with a "bairn's hymn" sounding in his ear, he who had "thrown a zone of mercy" around helpless childhood, passed over to see for himself those wondrous things which eye hath not seen and ear hath not heard, and which have not entered into the mind of man, not even into Guthrie's mind, so fertile in illustration and rich in imagination.

Philadelphia.

CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY.

"MISERABLE-SINNER CHRISTIANITY" IN THE HANDS OF THE RATIONALISTS

II. FROM CLEMEN TO PFLEIDERER

Twelve years intervened between Wernle's assault on "Miserable-Sinner Christianity" and his retraction, and it is necessary to give some account of the course of the debate through these years. We have already intimated that one of the effects of the publication of Wernle's book was to uncover a tendency and to create a party. A tendency was uncovered among adherents of the history-of-religion school to represent Paul as claiming for himself or asserting of all Christians either express sinlessness or something very like it, and this tendency rapidly hardened into a party-contention. Men like E. Grafe, H. J. Holtzmann, Paul Schmiedel, E. Teichmann, A. Jülicher, in reviewing Wernle's book, were quick to express complete or partial agreement with its general position.¹ Carl Clemen was perhaps the first, however, to associate himself with it in an independent discussion.

Before the end of the year Clemen had published the Biblical part of his *Christian Doctrine of Sin*—the only part ever published,—and he naturally included in it a section on "the dissemination of sin."² It had been the Biblical doctrine from the prophets down, he says, that sin is universal among men. But the possibility of overcoming it was always recognized for the future, and indeed was assumed for the past by the Priest Code and the Chronicler, and asserted for the present by Paul—and he might have added also by the other writers of the New Testament since he interprets most

¹ H. J. Holtzmann, in the *Theologischer Jahresbericht* XVII, 1898, p. 170 and XVIII, 1899, p. 187, gives references to the several reviews mentioned.

² *Die Christliche Lehre von der Sünde I: Die biblische Lehre*, 1897, pp. 100-122.

of the post-Pauline writers in this sense (Eph. i. 4; iv. 24, v. 1; I Pet. i. 15; Jas. i. 4; I John iii. 6, 9).³ Paul, he asserts,⁴ not only sets himself up as a model and boasts of his work, but "expressly ascribes perfection to himself"—for which assertion Clemen has, however, no better proof than is afforded by the merely general, and perfectly natural, assertions of I Thess. ii. 10; I Cor. iv. 3f; II Cor. vi. 3f. Paul, moreover, "nowhere speaks of sins committed by him after his conversion, and nowhere refers to them the sufferings which he so often recalls, as he must have done on his presuppositions, had he been conscious of any guilt whatever." Apparent confessions of imperfections are only apparent—I Cor. xv. 9, II Cor. v. 2, Rom. viii. 22f, Gal. ii. 20.

As for Rom. vii.—of course the presents are presents; we must not make the Apostle a comedian dramatizing a distant past: but it was written in a bad hour, when the Apostle was in a gloomy mood,—and therefore when he came to write the eighth chapter afterwards, he wrote in on the margin, "Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord," words which have crept since into the text. "Looked at as a whole," therefore, Rom. vii. means—what the moderns make it mean; and "in any case it has nothing to say against the freedom of Paul as a Christian in general from any consciousness of sin."⁶ As to Phil. iii. 12ff it is not to be denied that the efforts to empty it of its confession of imperfection have been imperfectly successful, but "neither is it to be forgotten that we have to do here precisely with the last of Paul's letters to congregations, and that we find in it elsewhere also a different estimate of the Christian life from Paul's earlier one; from it therefore we can draw no conclusions for the earlier period."⁷ This comment seems to convey an admission that Paul does not always teach his

³ P. 122.

⁴ P. 110.

⁵ P. 111.

⁶ P. 112.

⁷ P. 113.

own sinlessness or that of his converts. In his later epistles, at any rate, he has lost the assurance which is attributed to him on the basis of his earlier ones.⁸

With reference to his converts, it is argued that in presenting himself—and indeed Christ—as their model, Paul recognizes their ability to become like him—and Christ. There are passages, also, it is asserted, in which it is "expressly declared that the Christian no longer sins."⁹ Here the stress is laid on I Cor. vi. 11, Rom. v. 6, 8, and especially of course, on Rom. vi. 1ff, but also on Gal. iii. 2, v. 24, and finally Col. ii. 11. "In any case," the conclusion runs,¹⁰ "the transformation which has taken place in Christians through baptism is designated here again by so strong an expression, that it appears impossible to reduce it to a reversal merely of the relative strength of good and evil, to a removal of sin from the center to the periphery, to a certain inner separation from sin,—as Lütgert¹¹ has again of late sought to do." "I admit," Clemen adds, "that this explanation"—that is, Lütgert's—"is valid in the case of some passages; in the most of them, however, Paul speaks so clearly of the overcoming of sin through conversion, that all limitation appears to be excluded." Of course he should have added, "except the limitation of time"—but it is characteristic of this whole school of writers simply to assume that what is done in the matter of cleansing of Christians is done without any expenditure of time whatever, all at once, completely.

Clemen then does not press Paul's doctrine of the sinlessness of Christians quite to such extremities as Wernle, and he draws back altogether when it comes to Wernle's estimate of the Apostle himself. So far from an "abstract idealist," "doctrinaire fanatic," who flagrantly contradicts in his teaching both the facts and himself, Paul was, says

⁸ P. 119.

⁹ P. 114.

¹⁰ P. 116-117.

¹¹ The reference is to Lütgert, *Sündlosigkeit und Vollkommenheit*, 1897, pp. 38ff.

Clemen, a "sober realist," who kept his eye and hand precisely on the facts.¹² There is one thing, however, he says, which Wernle has missed in estimating Paul's dealing with sin in the churches: when Paul charges his converts with sinning, it was only certain special sins which he ascribes to them, and otherwise he praises them (I Thess. iv. 9f; I Cor. xi. 2, 17). There is no explanation of this, says Clemen,¹³ except that they had really conquered sin in general, but had not yet learned to look upon certain particular vices as sins. And here he draws an arrow from Scholz's quiver. Scholz very strikingly pictures the difficulties which the newly converted heathen must have had in comprehending the Christian standard of morality. "When we wonder at the open transgressions of the ten commandments of which we hear so often in the Pauline epistles," he says, "it should not be forgotten how new and unaccustomed many of the ethical requirements were for Christians of heathen origin; how many hindrances to the purer moral understanding must have arisen out of the instincts of the past. A just critic should allow that from such a start a good advance could be recognized in spite of all wavering, falling, holding back. This is precisely what Paul did." Certainly nothing truer could be said. But to say this, as Clemen does through Scholz's lips, is certainly not to say that Paul looked upon his converts as having already attained the goal. And Clemen himself has to admit¹⁴ that in his later epistles at least Paul—perhaps disheartened by the delay of the parousia—thought of his converts as only beginners. Their new moral life was not yet manifest, but still "hidden" with Christ in God (Col. ii. 3); the good work was only begun in them (Phil. i. 6); Paul himself was only beginning to know the power—it was a moral power—of Christ's resurrection (Phil. iii. 10). The goal of blamelessness still stood before them.

What Clemen teaches here, he repeats in the main in his

¹² P. 117.

¹³ P. 118.

¹⁴ P. 119.

Paul, His Life and Works,¹⁵ though not without modifications, the most notable of which is the apparent abandonment of the distinction between Paul's earlier and later teaching. Justification, he teaches here, has reference it is true only to *past* sins, but does not on that account fail of some effect upon the future. Sins committed after we believe, we must ourselves bear the punishment of: therefore believers are sick and die—sometimes suddenly and untimely. But since they are justified, they need not commit these sins; justification brings with it the *possibility* of sanctification. Now, being justified, we can satisfy the claims of God on us, however high they may be "We can walk in a high, holy life, because we know that our old man is crucified, therefore has paid its penalty; we can fulfil the law, after sin has been judged in the flesh."¹⁶ The consciousness of this was very strong in Paul and he expected it to be present in others in the measure in which "he saw in the Christian in principle the new man, who actually did not sin any more at all."¹⁷ "There was a time when we were weak and sinful, but now we are washed and sanctified, or figuratively expressed, are unleavened, so that there is no longer anything condemnable in us." This is the reason why Paul could speak of the forgiveness of sins as something past; believers have no present sins to be forgiven. Christ's intercession, however, no doubt remains, and will according to Paul's expectation be operative at the last judgment.

There is another side of the matter, however, which must not be overlooked. Although we have become new creatures in Christ, yet this life is still hidden in God. Paul considered himself not yet perfect, and did not need to be taught by experience that others were even less so. We cannot even pray as we ought and need the grace of God always. If in spite of this Paul still looked upon himself and others as without sin, the explanation is doubtless to

¹⁵ *Paulus, sein Leben und Wirken*, 1904, Vol. II, pp. 98ff.

¹⁶ P. 100.

¹⁷ P. 101.

be found in part in this—"that he did not consider every departure from the highest ideal as sin."¹⁸ It is found further in his expectation of an early end for all things. But what chiefly comes into consideration is that "Paul and the others had with their conversion really broken with sin, so that they feel now bound to the service of righteousness rather than of sin." If they were overtaken by a fault there was the hope that they would be recovered from it, and therefore could still stand unblamable at the parousia and receive God's praise.

All this is once more said over again with the added clearness suitable to its more popular destination, in Clemen's little handbook which he calls *The Development of the Christian Religion within the New Testament*, published in 1908.¹⁹ Here too he begins by pointing out that, according to Paul, "the death of Christ blots out only our former sins (Rom. iii. 25), and the judgment at the end of the day proceeds on the ground of *works*." No doubt even then grace will rule, but consider II Cor. v. 10. When Paul says in Rom. viii. 3 that God has judged sin in the flesh *in order that* the righteousness demanded by the law may be fulfilled in us, that proves that reconciliation so little supplants sanctification that it for the first time renders it *possible*. What it meant in Rom. vi. 7 is primarily that each one's own death has an expiatory value; as it is spoken, however, of us who have not died, it means that we are absolved from sin by the death of Jesus and that carries with it the further idea that we are no longer to serve sin—provided that we carry with us the mediating thought, that we are brought by the forgiveness of sins into a condition in which we need not serve sin. "So long as we still had to bear our guilt, we had always to say in our battle against sin that it was of no avail how much we attained, since the old guilt always remained; now that it is done away,

¹⁸ P. 102. He supports himself in this on Gottschick, Jacoby and Titius, as cited elsewhere, and repels Max Meyer's criticism.

¹⁹ *Die Entwicklung der christlichen Religion innerhalb des Neuen Testaments* 1908, pp. 88ff.

however, now that we have been assured of the grace and love of God, we can for the first time take up the battle against sin, and actually begin a new life."²⁰

It is important to pause here to note that the only effect of forgiveness looking to sanctification which Clemen here supposes Paul to intimate, is our enheartening for the conflict with sin. There is nothing intimated as to any interior effect of the death of Christ in the way of purifying our hearts. We are to sanctify ourselves under the inspiration of our liberation from guilt. The importance of making this clear arises from its connection with what immediately succeeds. For Clemen proceeds at once thus: "Yes, Paul assumes of his congregations that this has already happened with them, that they *have* died to sin (verse 2). Christ died for us, he says (Rom. v. 6), when we *were* still weak or sinners—now therefore we are no longer that: ye *were* slaves of sin, now however we have become obedient from the heart to the form of teaching which ye received (vi. 17); ye have washed and sanctified yourselves (I Cor. vi. 11) or, figuratively expressed, ye are unleavened (I Cor. v. 7). And now we understand why Paul, as already said, always relates reconciliation to the past sins, and speaks of forgiveness as something past (Col. iii. 13); the Christian ought actually not to sin any more at all." In this connection the deliverance from sin spoken of in this passage as already received by Christians can scarcely refer to anything more than deliverance from the guilt of sin. Their deliverance from sinning remains their own affair, wrought by their own efforts as a matter of duty under the inspiration of their forgiveness.

The sinlessness of Christians as such has become then only their duty to be sinless. And yet, just after thus explaining that all of a Christian's freedom from sin is the result of a battle against it, in obedience to the exhortations of the gospel, Clemen proceeds, just as if it was otherwise, to ask: But did not Paul have to fight against sin? Is

²⁰ P. 89.

not I Cor. ix. 27 there? And Rom. vii.? Or if Rom. vii. was written in a gloomy hour, is not Phil. iii. 12 there? And is not Paul always exhorting his readers to lay aside their sin? One thing is notable, he says: Paul has nowhere brought the death of Jesus into connection with their later sins, although he does speak once (Rom. viii. 34) of Jesus appearing before God for us. Which merely reminds us again that a Christian, having once been relieved of the burden of his guilt, is then left to take care of his own subsequent sins for himself. Then Clemen closes the discussion by telling us that we must observe three things, if we would understand Paul's position. The first of them is that "conversion was at that time actually the beginning of a new life; he who attached himself to the Christian community had actually (at least in principle) broken with his past." The second of them is that under the influence of his vivid expectation of the rapidly approaching end, "Paul could think that the change which had taken place in these newly converted men would protect them altogether from new sins." And the third of them, which he says is the main one, is that Paul was filled with "youthful faith in the divine power of the gospel, and knew nothing of the senile conception of Christianity as 'comforted sorrow for sin' (*getröster Sündenelend*)."¹ He hoped that his congregations would stand unblamable at the coming of Christ. That is to say, Paul in his youthful fervor of faith was optimistic.

It seems apparent that in the ten years of his development covered by these three books, the doctrine of the sinless Christian lost its point in Clemen's thinking. He has abated nothing, however, of his hatred of "miserable-sinner Christianity." "The senile conception of Christianity, as 'comforted sorrow for sin,'" is a tolerably biting characterization to make of the type of Christianity which presumably he identified with the doctrine of the Reformers. The excuse may justly be offered, no doubt, that if he does identify a Christianity which could be so described with the doctrine of the Reformers he has fallen into a mistake very

prevalent in the circles in which he moved. And it is to be remembered in his favor that the intemperance of his language is apparently the result of a zeal which reflects a robust sense of the duty of moral effort. If "miserable-sinner Christianity" represents a tendency to acquiesce in sin and to substitute constantly repeated forgiveness of sins passively accepted as inevitable, for a manly battle against all sin and a steady advance upward toward conquest,—why, then, it fairly deserves Clemen's characterization. Clemen has, however, tripped here over that facile "either—or" which catches the feet of so many of his fellows. We do not have to choose between the alternatives of a Christianity of mere ethical effort and a Christianity of passive submission to unopposed sinning. There is something much better than either, between.

The defence of the Reformers against Wernle's strictures was undertaken by a fellow Ritschlian, Johannes Gottschick in an effective article printed in one of the later numbers of the *Journal for Theology and Church* for 1897.²¹ The thesis of the article is that the difference, amounting to contrariety, which Wernle has attempted to establish between the Reformers and Paul, in their attitudes to the Christian life, is purely imaginary; the Reformers must be recognized as the continuators of Paulinism. The main contention of Wernle, says Gottschick, is to the effect that "by maintaining the continuation of sinning in Christians, the Reformation has obliterated Paul's sharp separation between the state of sin and the state of grace, and—a thing of which Paul knew nothing—has led the Christian who has to judge himself to be a sinner to maintain his confidence in God by means of reflection on forgiveness in Christ; and thus justification becomes to it no longer a single but an ever-repeated act."²² Behind this representa-

²¹ *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1897, Vol. VII. pp. 398-460, article on "Paulinismus und Reformation." Compare with it another article by Gottschick in the immediately preceding number of the same magazine (pp. 352-384) entitled "Propter Christum. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Versöhnungslehre Luthers."

²² P. 403.

tion, however, lie two questions of fact with reference to Paul's teaching, simple enough to make it easy to obtain answers to them: (1) Does the sinner remain a sinner after justification? (2) Is the Christian's confidence in God based on his assurance of the forgiveness of his sins in Christ?

To the first of these questions Gottschick's answer is given in the following passage:²³ "The question is how far the change which is given for Paul with faith and the reception of the Spirit reaches. According to Wernle, it produces complete freedom from sin, and this is to the Apostle characteristic for the nature of the Christian; Paul, it is said, knows no process, no development of the Christian life, but assumes that the ideal, that which Christians ought to be, they already are, and that the Spirit and the Christian state are lost with every sin, even the lighter ones. The assertion that Paul takes the ideal for the real and knows no development of the Christian life is, however, the manifest reverse of the actual state of the case. In all his letters the advancement, the growth, the strengthening of the Christian life is an object of the Apostle's exhortation and prayers." Citing then I Thess. iii. 12, iv. 10, Phil. i. 11, I Cor. xv. 58, I Thess. iii. 13, II Thess. ii. 17, iii. 3, I Cor. iv. 16, I Thess. i. 10, II Thess. i. 3, II Cor. x. 10, Col. i. 10, 11, I Cor. xv. 58, Gottschick adds: "These passages already show that for Paul, the Christian life is more than the actualization or even merely authentication of a condition; it is advance and development in both the extensive and intensive reference." Wernle, then, he continues, "has not shown that the Christian is a *sinless* pneumatic. He admits himself that the apostle, in his practice, expects the recurrence of sin in the Christian life; but he contends that in theory he ignores or even denies it. For this he appeals to I Cor. iii. 4 and Gal. vi. 1, passages which are to prove that to the Apostle the Christian loses the Spirit with every sin. But I Cor. iii. 1-4 does not say that the

²³ Pp. 414ff.

Corinthians have *lost* what they *possessed* or have *ceased* to be what they *were*; but that they have *not yet* attained that stage in life in Christ, in which they should long have stood. Although, according to iii. 16, the Temple of the Spirit, they are nevertheless not yet 'pneumatics.' To say that Paul at iii. 16 has already 'forgotten' what he said in iii. 4 is nothing but a bad evasion. In Gal. vi. 1, too, the pneumatics who are to restore those that stumble—who are regarded as Christian brothers, just as the dissembling Peter and Barnabas are in iii. 12ff.,—can be only a particular class of Christians, and in that case were perhaps distinguished by charismata and on that account called to such service. The Christian life *cannot* be any longer a life of bold service of sin, and *need not* be any longer a life of weak slavery to sin of a will wishing the good. The possibility of individual transgressions lies nevertheless according to Gal. vi. 1 near to everyone. What has changed is the *habitus*, the total disposition (*Gesamtcharacter*). "And now the denial of sin in the Christian life in Rom. vi. 1ff.! As if what is discussed there were whether in the course of the Christian life, which for Paul is self-evidently directed to a moral end, sin can *occur*,—and not rather whether faith in grace and emancipation from the law are a *license* or even an *incitement* to sin. And what Paul deduces here is not the impossibility of individual sins, but impulse and power for a life for God and righteousness in contrast with a former service of sin." On Wernle's representation that Paul's passage from the indicative to the imperative in dealing with the relations of Christians to sin—leaping, without any mediation and without noticing it, from the ethics of miracle to the ethics of will,—Gottschick remarks:²⁴ "What appears contradictory to Wernle, is, so far as I see, only that a break with sin in principle can coëxist with the necessity of admonition to contend against it, and farther, that a consciousness of a nature-like propulsion can coëxist with spontaneous effort to obligated ends."

²⁴ P. 418.

The question raised by Wernle, Why does not the Apostle, in dealing with the sin of Christians, comfort them with reminders of the forgiveness which lies for them in Christ as the Reformers do? would be most directly answered, no doubt, by challenging the fact which is assumed in it. It would be enough to point to a declaration like Rom. viii. 1 which, especially in its context, before and after, cannot possibly be made to refer only to the past sins of Christians, and which very eminently is of the nature of a comforting declaration. Gottschick is not prepared, however, to make just this rejoinder.²⁵ He prefers therefore to urge an argument *e concessis*, to the effect,—that the forgiving grace of God is certainly everywhere presupposed in Paul.²⁶ Unrepentant sinners are of course dealt with by efforts to awaken their obtuse consciences and to bring them to repentance. "Even the strictest Protestant would have ventured on no other course." But, in any event, even according to Wernle himself, "faith, baptism, justification, in Paul's sense, ground a religious relation to God with the reversion of salvation." And if justification renders salvation certain, it is absurd to speak of it as absolution only from the sins that are past; it must exercise dominion over

²⁵ P. 420: "In one matter, to be sure, Wernle is right, although his theory of the sinlessness of the Christian is not discernable in Paul: Paul did not reflect on sin as a thing which adheres to the Christian life permanently and normally and destroys its joyousness, and therefore needs a neutralizer through a continuously renewed forgiveness. And neither did he, when sin encountered him in the community, point the sinners to the grace of God and comfort them with forgiveness. The difference between him and the Reformers appears particularly characteristically in Rom. viii. 1. There is given to him—the connection compels this view—by the experience of emancipation from the law of sin and death by the Spirit of life in Christ, the consciousness of no longer being subject to any sort of 'condemnation,'—whereas the Reformers explain the passage in such a manner that this consciousness is rather to spring from God's objective gracious judgment." Gottschick is confusing here the *proof* of "no condemnation to those in Christ Jesus," with its *ground*; or to speak broadly, assurance with salvation itself. He accordingly shows some hesitation in an attached note.

²⁶ Pp. 428 ff.

the whole life, and, if sins be committed in that life, absolve from them also. "The formula that the preaching of faith, that is, the doctrine of justification, has merely missionary significance, is conversion-theology, is therefore simply untrue, so far as it has the meaning that justification brings something only for entrance into the Christian state and the community, but not for the continuation of the Christian life in the community."²⁷ Wernle has himself contradicted this representation when he points out that justification guarantees salvation at the judgment-day, and assures the enjoyment of future benefits, that it transfers us into the state of the "righteous," and looks therefore not merely backward to the sins that are past but forward to the heritage of the just. And Paul contradicts it no less, in passages like Rom. v. 1-11, viii. 31-39, in which he expounds the significance which being justified has for the believer, bringing to him triumphant confidence in God, which raises him above the trials and perils of life and assures him of salvation. According to this representation, the faith that justifies must of course remain as the motive-power of the whole life. "Faith, in Paul's sense, which supports itself on the love of God in Christ and longs for and confidently awaits life in the Kingdom of holiness and love, includes inalienably the earnest direction of the will to the moral goal."²⁸ Justification, however, as Paul conceives it, does not act merely as a powerful incitement to right living; it is also necessarily a constant absolvment for the sins of life. On Wernle's own representation which allows that the faith that justifies grounds in Paul's view a religious relation with God which involves in it the reversion of salvation, it must have been included in Paul's view that the relation with God was destroyed by every sin, great or small. "Were,"²⁹ however, that the case, all analogy suggests that simple amendment would not be thought enough, but special transactions would be required for atonement. It is only the moralism of the

²⁷ P. 405.

²⁸ P. 413-414.

²⁹ P. 429.

Enlightenment which has allayed the uneasy conscience with mere amendment. There is no trace of anything like this in Paul. Wernle himself, indeed, declares that 'Paul never, it seems, raised the question how the Christian obtains forgiveness when he sins' (p. 69). The presupposition for such an attitude can only be that he and his congregations did not feel such sins as abrogating childship to God. And that finds an excellent explanation precisely from the significance which justification (or its synonyms) has to him for the Christian life—that it does not mean only non-reckoning of past sins, but transference into the positive and perpetual condition of the children of God and heirs of His kingdom, yes, into the already present enjoyment of its benefits. The objectivity of the electing and calling grace of God, in connection with the assurance of already enjoying a foretaste of a future benefit, accompanying to him the expression of the relatively great transformation, imparted such strength and confidence in God and hope in the coming salvation, that it did not waver because of individual defeats in the struggle. And the Apostle's own judgment was not different: he only over and over again inculcated the condition which must be fulfilled, if this hope was not to deceive and this security was to be no fleshly one,—aspiration after what is above, and—the special form which this condition took over against intruding sin,—sincere and earnest repentance. Paul then does not speak of forgiveness as a continuously repeated necessary factor of the Christian life only because justification includes it once for all."

The direct contradiction in which Wernle places Paul and the Reformers in their judgments upon the Christian life—representing the one as looking upon Christians, as such, as sinless and the other as thinking of them, to put it at its height, as "all sin"—has no foundation in fact. The "optimism," ascribed to Paul by Wernle, Gottschick declares, transforms him into a "psychological monstrosity," at once "the incomparable spiritual adviser and the doc-

trinaire incapable of learning from experience."³⁰ His letters teach us that he saw things as they were and realized fully all the shortcomings of his Christians. Of course he estimated also at its true value the radical break with sin which they had made, the power they had acquired in their conversion to turn away from the old evil life, and to fight their way toward the goal of Christian perfection. And this new life which had come to Christians was as little neglected by Luther as by Paul. Nothing would have shocked Luther more than any suggestion that Christians have obtained nothing by believing, except an ultimate salvation. Sinners they are, who sin daily and need daily forgiveness. But they are not as the sinners of the Gentiles; with them "sin is not as it was before, because its head has been bruised by remission of sin."³¹ "They are not made but in the making,"³² but they are in the making; and that means that they are partly made. By both Paul and Luther Christians were well understood to be in the process of salvation; but this very fact that they were and were seen to be in the process of salvation opened the way to the possibility of a difference in emphasis. How shall the Christian, by nature a sinner, but now regenerated by the Spirit and justified by faith and becoming more and more conformed to the image of God's Son, be characterized? From the remaining sinfulness of his nature? Or from his new creation and his now waxing holiness? Insistence on his character as "miserable sinner," may be exaggerated into denial or neglect of the transformation which has taken place in him. Insistence on his character as new creature may be exaggerated into assertion of a perfection already attained. It would not do Wernle serious injustice to say that in his view something like these opposite exaggerations was precisely what took place respectively in Paul and Luther. Gottschick denies that any such exaggeration took place in the case of either. But he is prepared to admit that a real

³⁰ P. 427.

³¹ *Werke* (Erl. ed) XIX. 41, cited by Gottschick, p. 438.

³² XVIII. 188, cited p. 440.

difference exists between Paul and Luther, arising from their throwing their emphasis respectively in the direction of these two opposite exaggerations.^{32a} He is prepared to go indeed further than this, and to attribute to them a far-reaching difference in their definitions of sin. They both have the same state of things before their eyes, he says,³³ a will energetically directed to the good, which, however, is still only advancing to perfection, and still has to contend with the temptations and antagonisms of sin continuing to work in the periphery of the personal life, and thus is often betrayed into manifest transgressions. "But they pass very different judgments upon it." "This is explained," he now goes on to say, "by their applying a different standard of judgment. Paul characterized as sin in the complex of the Christian life only notorious lapses into sins of sensuality and selfishness; but on the other hand he did not so regard lagging in the attainment of extensive and intensive perfection, in trust in God, in love, in the sanctification of the whole life, which stood for him as the goal of his Christians, nor yet the struggle with the enticements and oppositions of the flesh which made themselves felt. Luther on the other hand, with inflexible sternness pled, in opposition to the scholastic theology, for the standpoint that every falling-short precisely of this Pauline ideal of perfection—to cover which he extended the Decalogue—is condemnable sin. Precisely the fact that the Christian life is a striving towards a goal is to him a proof of the continuance of sinfulness in the regenerate."

If this be true, then the Reformation has greatly refined and deepened the Pauline conception of sin. The purpose which Gottschick has in view in affirming its truth is to account for what he conceives (with Wernle) to be the greater preoccupation of the Reformation theology with sin. It has enlarged the conception of sin, he says, and, having enlarged the conception of sin, it has felt the condemnation

^{32a} Pp. 438, 448.

³³ P. 438 f.

of sin and the need of forgiveness, if not more strongly, yet more extensively than Paul. Here we have no doubt a difference with Paul, he intimates, but not a contradiction. This is the way he puts it:³⁴—"That Luther perpetually felt disquieted religiously by the continued conflict with the flesh and by the delay in attaining the ideal of perfection, or let us say of the Christian character, and had need of a counterpoise against this disquiet, is therefore the new thing, as compared with Paul, which remains. That, however, he found the counterpoise in justification for Christ's sake, is not an extension of the meaning given to it by Paul, beyond the beginning of the Christian life to its whole course. In Paul, too, it extends over the whole course of the Christian life; objectively as the basis of the relation of childship to God or of the right to the inheritance of eternal life; and subjectively in the humility with which the moral deliverance leads back to God and in the confidence with which protection from all inimical powers, the fatherly guidance of God, and perfecting from God are expected. It is much rather a logical application (*folgerichtige Anwendung*) of the fundamental religious conception which Paul has formulated in his doctrine of justification, to the changed judgment (required by the changed circumstances) on the state of things, that is to say, on the Christian life, fundamentally renewed, it is true, but still striving and growing. It is not in this as if Luther in the forgiveness of the sins of the Christian thought of a continuously repeated forgiveness of individual sins; he was just as conscious as Paul of the unity and completeness of the state of grace, given objectively with justification, or the individual promise of grace, subjectively with faith. Forgiveness, or justification, and also the absolution given in the sacrament of penance, is not with him a dispensation for a *quantum* of sins, but the reception of the *whole person* into the divine favor, the transference of it into the unitary and permanent state of grace. And it is the task of faith to raise itself.

³⁴ P. 448.

in the assurance of this, above the disquiet produced by the painful sense of continued sinfulness and by serious sins, recognized and repented of. It is on the one side included in this that it is not necessary, in the accompanying mood of humble trust in God's grace, to reflect scrupulously on daily sins; and on the other side it is not excluded that the application to particular cases of the justification which governs the whole life—since it is not a logical but an emotional one—will often enough be brought about as the restoration of a shaken or renewed consciousness of God's grace."

Among the writers on the ethics of the New Testament during this period, Hermann Jacoby³⁵ claims our attention at this point because of the completeness with which he associates himself with Gottschick, and that especially in the dubious views of Paul's conception of sin which we have just seen Gottschick enunciating. He was preceded by G. Mühlau,³⁶ whose revulsion from Wernle's whole representation was much stronger, and followed after a few years by A. Juncker,³⁷ writing from a modern point of view but protesting against the representation of Paul which sets his "theory" and "practice" in contradictory antagonism, and (following A. Seeberg here) maintaining on somewhat doubtful grounds the use of the Lord's Prayer by Paul and his consequent regular praying for forgiveness of sins. Jacoby, without expressly intimating any exceptions, represents himself as coinciding in Gottschick's results, and having in view for himself only to "supplement" them.³⁸ His presentation of their common views, however, is so clear and pointed that it will repay us to give them independent attention.

He begins his exposition of Paul's conception of the

³⁵ *Neutestamentliche Ethik*. 1899, pp. 320 ff, 396 ff.

³⁶ *Zur Paulinischen Ethik*, in the *Abhandlungen Alex. von Oettingen gewidmet*, 1898, pp. 220-244.

³⁷ *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus*, 1 Hälfte 1904. Also *Das Gebet bei Paulus*, 1905.

³⁸ P. 325.

Christian's relation to sin with two affirmations.³⁹ The first of them is that "Paul characterizes the path of the Christian's life as a path of victory." "For a true Christian," he affirms, "there can be no such thing as a life in the service of sin; a dominion of sin, a 'reign,' 'rule' of it, is excluded (Rom. v. 6, 8)." In Paul's view it is the other side of the Christian's "double life" that is to be emphasized; the Christian belongs to what he is to become, not to what he is leaving behind him. This is Jacoby's protest against what he conceives to be the "miserable-sinner" conception of the Christian life. It is the seamy side of the Christian life which is the subject of his own second affirmation. There is such a thing as sinful concupiscence, and it has its allurements: and we are not without a painful sense that there is something in us in sympathy with it. But, and this is the second affirmation, Paul did not range this "under the category of sin," "no consciousness of guilt grew out of the conflict for him." "He did not regard even this condition, bound up with a victorious conflict, though it contradicts the moral ideal, as sin. Falling short of the moral ideal and sinning are by no means the same thing to him. The idea of sin has for him a narrower compass." This is Jacoby's act of adherence to Gottschick's representation as to Paul's undeveloped conception of sin, and he proceeds at once to transcribe approvingly a page of Gottschick's discussion, and then to repeat and enforce its essential elements in his own language.

"No one," he says,⁴⁰ "has appreciated like Paul the conflict against the flesh in its entire greatness, in its complete difficulty. He sees the old man in his dreadful form, all the sinful lusts which move in him; he demands with uncompromising decision the putting off of this old man (Col. iii. 5-9); but the experience of these allurements is not to him sin, but suffering, an almost unendurable suffering. Out of this feeling of suffering he exclaims, O

³⁹ P. 325.

⁴⁰ P. 326.

wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me out of the body of this death (Rom. vii. 24). A cry of pain out of a past continuing into the present. For though he is removed from the service of sin under the dominion of the law, the condition of suffering, which is connected with the conflict against sin, abides with him. And how far Paul knows himself to be from the goal! He has not yet reached it, he has not yet attained perfection, but with straining strength he hastens toward it. He judges the life of salvation which has been built up in the community, as only a beginning (Phil. i. 6). And it is not without anxiety that Paul looks on the path of conflict, which he must still traverse—on the temptations that he must endure (Phil. iii. 10-14). He has no doubt moreover that on this path transgressions can occur. No Christian is certain that a temptation may not overcome him; that he may not permit himself to be betrayed by the flesh into a fault (Gal. vi. 1). That declaration of the Apostle's is very important for the understanding of his view of the continuing of sin in Christians. Faults which may be thought of as sins of inadvertence can occur even in a normal Christian life, and in this sense Paul will have adopted the Publican's prayer and the fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer. In this consciousness of the danger of temptation, of entanglement with lusts of the flesh, he requires from everyone who will partake of the Lord's Supper that he prove himself (I Cor. xi. 28, 31), and therefore assumes that a Christian will always find himself at his best. Paul was certainly not an enthusiast; the traits of an enthusiast are wrongly attributed to him by Wernle. But in spite of all that, it is true that Paul looked on the course of life of the Christian as a course of victory, sin as a slain foe, and the fundamental tone of his confession forms not the *Kyrie eleison* but the *Hallelujah*. Thus it ought to be in the case of every true Christian. But Paul also knows that reversions to the stage of the old man take place in the Christian life; not mere 'transgressions,' but 'sins' in the full sense of the word. To him

however, this is neither a necessary thing, nor a thing to be universally presupposed of Christians. It nevertheless does actually happen. In that case, however, the Christian state is imperiled, shaken, and must be reestablished in the same way in which it was first begun,—in the way of 'repentance,' of the 'godly sorrow' which saves (II Cor. vii. 9-11)."

According to this representation the Christian is conceived rather as capable of sinning, liable to sin, than as actually a sinner by nature and through the manifestations of that nature also an inevitable sinner in fact. Original sin is reduced to an incitement of sin, a temptation to sinning which may be successfully resisted. Even sins of inadvertence, although liable to occur in all lives, apparently need not occur in any. Sins "in the full sense of the word," we gather, are rare in truly Christian circles; and when they occur are looked upon almost as having destroyed the Christian life itself. No Christian has as yet attained his goal: he is in the making and not made. But an impression is conveyed that the goal set before Christians is in the technical sense of the words very much a "counsel of perfection." Certainly the ideal which Paul held before himself and his converts stretched far above anything he could, on Jacoby's representation, call mere cessation of sinning; and he is almost given the appearance of busying himself not with delivering himself and them from sin but with elevating himself and them into something like supermen,—into a region stretching beyond what can be easily spoken of as human. The element of truth in this representation should not blind us to the serious error of it. It is the result of minimizing the amount of sinfulness still clinging to and manifesting itself in the Christian life—original sin, actual sinning—until little room seems to be left for that continued ethical development on which nevertheless Jacoby vigorously insists.

Paul, says Jacoby,⁴¹ when expounding Paul's teaching on the developing life of the Christian, looks on the path over

⁴¹ Pp. 396 ff.

which the Christian advances from a two-fold point of view. "It is on the one hand to him the path of effort, of personal exertion, of his own achievement. The Apostle considers himself a combatant, who strains every nerve to win the imperishable crown, who practices self-denial to reach the goal (I Cor. x. 24-27). He knows that he has not yet scaled the height of perfection (*Vollendung*), that he does not yet stand at the goal; but he expends his whole energy upon the effort to win it; dissatisfied (*nicht befriedigt*) with the moral stage to which he has attained, he aspires to a higher (Phil. iii. 12-14). Thus the moral life appears to him a perpetual struggle, which reaches no end within the limits of earthly existence." There was another point of view, however, from which he looked on it. "But he looks at the same moral life," continues Jacoby, "as a development which takes place with inner necessity, like an organic process, which, once begun, if it is not arrested by some accident, reaches the ends by which it is determined by means of the action of the forces operative in it. The Christian who sows to the Spirit, that is, lets the Holy Spirit work on him, follows His incitement, reaps of the Spirit eternal life (Gal. vi. 8)." Because he places himself in the service of God, a moral quality "forms in him which fashions itself into holiness, and has as its ultimate result eternal life, without this quality ceasing to be a gift of God's grace; for it is the grace of God which introduces this ethical power, carries it on, and brings it to its conclusion (Rom. vi. 22, 23)." The main point here is clearly and firmly stated: the Christian life is from the ethical point of view a process, advancing continually to the as yet unattained goal; and this process has a two-fold aspect, according as it is viewed from the human side, as effort, or from the divine side, as re-creation; that is, according as we think of the exhortation, "Work out your own salvation," or of the encouragement "For it is God that worketh in you."

Jacoby now proceeds⁴² by adducing the great passages

⁴² P. 397.

II Cor. iii. 18, iv. 16, and warning us at the same time that, in Paul's view, "this constantly advancing procession of glory, which is grounded in childship to God, does not prevent Christians longing for a condition in which the full enjoyment of childship to God shall be possessed by them." "At present," he explains, "their childship to God is attested to them in the purely spiritual sphere, but their sensuous being is a mode of existence which in the burden of the afflictions which fall on them, in the temptations which are connected with it, contradicts the mode of existence which, according to their spiritual nature, they possess as children of God. They therefore long after the redemption of the body, after the resolution of the disharmony between the spiritual and bodily phases of their life, after the harmony in which they shall experience the complete realization of childhood to God (Rom. viii. 23, 30)." In comparison with this future condition, Paul, says Jacoby, speaks of our present blessedness as a "hidden" possession: we are pressing on towards things as yet unseen and only in the beyond shall we attain our end. "Thus the consciousness of Christians is filled with contrasting feelings and exertions. On the one side they are placed in the visible world in which they are to maintain themselves in faithfulness in their calling, in obedience to the ordinances approved by God, in sanctification of life—in a world, over against which they are nevertheless inwardly alien. On the other side they belong to a heavenly world, the powers of which are communicated only to believers, of which we can become aware, on which we lay hold, only by faith." Only when Christ appears out of that "hiddenness" in which he now works, will the inner life of Christians find an outer manifestation corresponding to Him. "To this crisis of their condition they are ripening by inner development, by constant growth, which is conditioned by the knowledge of God (Cor. i. 10)."

This essentially true account of Paul's doctrine of the Christian life in the world, presents the Christian life as in its very essence a preparation for the life to come, and as

therefore in every respect now incomplete. Paul teaches not a this-world but a next-world Christianity. Everything is begun here; nothing completed. It is of the very essence of his teaching, therefore, that we are not here perfect, that, in our ethical development as well as in every other, we are only in the making. Additional point is given to this by the striking paragraph of Jacoby's discussion in which he raises our eyes from the individual to the Christian community and from the Christian community to the world—which is, after all said, God's world. The consummation of the ethical life, he tells us,⁴³ is not related by Paul to the individual Christian alone but to the whole Christian community. It too is in a process of God-wrought growth; it too is to be the body of Christ, the temple of the Holy Ghost. But the gaze of the Apostle is not directed to Christ's community, he now adds, as to a holy island in an unbelieving world; but to the entirety of humanity, which is to be taken up into the Kingdom of Christ. Thus, at the end of the road, every enemy shall be seen to be conquered (I Cor. xv. 26, 28), and every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord (Phil. ii. 11).

Something like what Jacoby does for Paul is done for John by A. Titius from his more vigorously Ritschlian standpoint.⁴⁴ If, according to John, eternal life is already had here and now, it is nevertheless not here and now enjoyed in its completeness. Christianity is with John too a next-world religion: the Christian is in this life in the Way, not at the Goal (cf. the designation of Christianity as the Way in Acts xiv. 2, xix. 9. 23). And the difference concerns every relation of life, not least the relation of Christians to sin. The world they live in is an evil world, and they are liable to temptation. "They are moreover in need of perennial (*dauernd*) cleansing (Jno. xv. 2, I Jno. iii. 3) and emancipation from the power of sin (Jno. viii. 32); they must ever confess that they have sinned (I Jno. i. 8-10)

⁴³ P. 398.

⁴⁴ *Die Neutestamentliche Lehre von der Seligkeit*, III. 1900, pp. 17ff.

and are therefore condemned by their hearts (I Jno. iii. 19, 20) and need forgiveness (I Jno. i. 9, 11, i. 2)." Paul no doubt presupposes "the perpetual necessity of forgiveness of sin." But John does more than that. He emphasizes it. "It is emphatically asserted that forgiveness of sins belongs to the permanent life-conditions of the community, because the notion that we do not have sin and therefore do not need forgiveness rests in self-deception and is excluded by God's word (I Jno. i. 8, 10, ii. 1f. 12). With this it accords that the Risen One imparts to His own the right to dispose of the forgiveness of sins; this presupposes the state of forgiveness of sins as a personal possession of the community (Jno. xx. 23). But also the particular conditions, under which the individual appropriation of forgiveness of sins stands, are discussed . . ."⁴⁵ Nevertheless, says Titius, with all this, there is a difference between John—and Paul too, who, had he dealt with these matters as fully as John does, could scarcely have treated them differently—and Luther. It is a difference only of degree, it is true,—of the degree in which the consciousness of sin gives its character to the Christian consciousness; but there is none the less a difference. With John—"perpetual incompleteness and sin are undoubtedly recognized; but it does not make a relative Christian perfection impossible; this appears rather as normal. Thus at I Jno. ii. 1 the sin of the Christian is thought of as exceptional; and in I Jno. iv. 22, Jno. xv. 8, 16, the joy of prayer is conditioned by the consciousness of fulfilling God's commandment and of doing what is pleasing to Him." We do not see, however, how Luther can be interpreted as greatly differing from this: he too supposed the Christian to be a Christian—one who had broken with sin in principle, and though in perpetual need of forgiveness, yet also in the perpetual joy of salvation.

In dealing with the portions of the New Testament not connected by him with the names of Paul and John, Titius

⁴⁵ P. 44.

speaks of the emergence in them of a new problem—the problem of the relation of the justification or the forgiveness of sins obtained in baptism to the sins of Christians.⁴⁶ Paul, says he, had scarcely related his doctrine of justification to the continuing sin of Christians. The Apocalypse, Acts, Pastoral Epistles—for he denies these to Paul—give no certain guidance. But, fortunately, there is the Epistle to the Hebrews. It speaks here plainly, and speaks strongly, “relating the forgiveness of sins obtained by Christ to the whole life of Christians.” “On the ground of the divine will, the sanctification of Christians follows from the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all; they are and remain holy (perfect tense, x. 10). By a single act He has sanctified the people of God (xiii. 12, x. 29 cf. x, ix). So that now all of them are holy (iii. i. vi. 10, xiii. 24). The application to individuals is accomplished by the sprinkling of their hearts with the blood of Christ, and the washing of their bodies with pure water, that is, in baptism (x. 22). The fundamental ideas of the author place beyond doubt that he considered, not that the forgiveness at baptism required supplementing, but that the forgiveness then once for all given conveyed a permanent (compare the perfect, ‘having been sprinkled’) relation to God not capable of destruction by sin (within certain limits). This follows already from Christ’s offering taking the place of the entire Old Testament expiatory system. What distinguishes the New from the Old Covenant is that God will no longer remember sins and transgressions (viii. 12, x. 17). From that, Hebrews draws the conclusion that where such forgiveness is present, the sin-offering no longer is made (x. 18). Therefore the single sin-offering of Christ expresses God’s permanent readiness to forgive, not a once for all forgiveness, but a permanent relation of forgiveness, arranged once for all in baptism . . . ” “It is manifest,” Titius concludes after presenting much further evidence,⁴⁷

⁴⁶ Vol. IV, p. 180 f.

⁴⁷ P. 182.

"that here for the first time, the fundamental Pauline idea of justification has received a form, in which it is capable of satisfying the changed need, the need of assurance of permanent forgiveness for sin." We gather that on this view the Reformation might derive its specific quality if not from Paul, yet at least from the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

It is when treating Paul's teaching, however, that Titius formally enters into the controversy as to the sins of Christians.⁴⁸ His mode of dealing with it has close affinities with that of Jacoby. He draws back a little, indeed, from Gottschick's and Jacoby's representation that Paul's idea of sinning was a somewhat narrow one. He is willing to allow, it is true, that Paul did not think of every failure of the Christian to correspond with the highest ideal, as sin. But he is quick to warn against attributing to the Apostle the low moral standard which does not look upon the inner contradiction of the flesh as sin, and to insist upon the comprehensive breadth of his recognition of the sinful. It cannot reasonably be denied, he says,⁴⁹ that Paul considered every movement of the sensuous desire which runs athwart the divine requirements—and the divine requirements coalesce with him with the "ideal"—to be sinful. The love of our neighbor is not a mere ideal of perfection with him, but a binding requirement of the law, breach of which falls under the curse. Every action which is not accompanied with the religious assurance that it is permissible, or rather is pleasing to God, is branded by him as sin,—which certainly shows an exceptional delicacy of moral judgment. Add the sharp contrasts which he draws between Spirit and flesh, light and darkness, righteousness and sin; and observe that, according to him, it is not given to men to stand neutral between these forces, but each one must take one side or the other:—surely that has not the appearance of looking only on the

⁴⁸ Vol. II, pp. 76 ff.

⁴⁹ P. 81.

grosser failings and faults as sin. In a word, while we need not attribute to Paul "a scrupulous and nervous anxiety of sin-consciousness," we cannot deny to him a clear and accurate and comprehensive sense of sin, as sin. We are not to suppose that he thought highly of the moral life of Christians because he thought lightly of the evil of sin. That way of answering the question raised by Wernle of whether Paul considered Christians sinners is barred.

The question no doubt would already be answered if we could follow Mühlau in considering Rom. vii. 14-25 a transcript of the Christian consciousness. Rejecting that interpretation of this passage does not leave us, however, in doubt as to Paul's attitude towards the Christian life. The Apostle does not look upon the salvation which has become the possession of Christians, although it is in its innermost nature really divine salvation, as, as yet the final salvation, but as incomplete, so that the position of Christians in the world is one not yet worthy of the children of God.⁵⁰ Sin and the Spirit can dwell together in the human soul—not the dominion of sin and the dominion of the Spirit, but sin and the Spirit. Neither in the seventh chapter of Romans nor anywhere else does Paul know the notion that the dominion of the Spirit is empirically compatible with the dominion of sin; nowhere does he recognize the alternation of the victorious advance of the Spirit and a retrograde moral movement, as the permanent rule of the Christian life. "But it is not less wrong, it seems to me," continues Titius,⁵¹ "when the theory is ascribed to the Apostle—a thing which A. Ritschl did not do—that the Christian does not sin." Von Soden, Mühlau, Gottschick have brought forward much material to the contrary, but something more may be said. In saying it there is to be emphasized first of all that "not only particular observations, but precisely the whole theory of the Apostle, prove that he considered the life of Christians as sinful. That is already clear from the fact

⁵⁰ P. 77.

⁵¹ P. 80.

that the present state of Christians has as its characteristic the presence in them of the two opposing factors, the flesh and the Spirit. "It is, however, self-evident that the morality of conflict and strife is not the highest, but that the measure of effort required marks at the same time the measure of power which sin still possesses even in the believer. To attribute to the Apostle the notion that the Christian does not sin, means therefore, to attribute to him that he considers the inner opposition of the flesh as not sin, that is, that he operates with too low a moral standard. If, however, his norm of righteousness consists in perfect love of God and men, then every impulse repugnant to it, even though it be overcome, is sin (Rom. vii. 7); there is, however, no lack in the Christian life also of such impulses proceeding from the flesh (Gal. v. 17, Col. iii. 5); and there can be no lack of them because these lusts are the movements of our flesh (Eph. ii. 3) inseparable from our mortal body (Rom. vi. 12). If then the moral norm is not externalized after a fashion wholly incompatible with Rom. vii. 7 and with the whole inner conception of the Apostle, then the fundamental fact of the existence of flesh and Spirit in the Christian life already brings with it the sinfulness of the life."⁵² This is far from the only evidence of the fact which Titius produces, but it may serve as a sample of his reasoning. As to Paul himself, it is true that it is not easy to turn up passages in which he ascribes present sins to himself; and he speaks too of Christians, from the point of view of the Spirit which dwells in them, as sinning rather through inadvertence and through weakness than by determinate purpose. They are Christians; and sin is represented by him as an ever more and more disappearing element in the Christian life, and he presupposes a really progressive approach to the ideal of perfection (e.g. Phil. iii. 12ff.). "But sin always forms a limitation to the complete blessedness of the Christian. And it is only in the resurrection, as the context of Phil.

⁵² P. 81.

iii. 10 and 14 shows, that the goal of sinless perfection beckons."⁵³

The discussion aroused by Wernle's book was thus obviously moving, from the first, even within the limits of the Ritschlian school, towards the decisive refutation of his central contention—that, according to Paul, Christians do not sin,—and the consequent isolation of it as the peculiar property of those extremists who had come now to be known as the history-of-religion school. The impression is even received that, had it not been for their feeling of loyalty to their master, "the regular Ritschlians," if we may so speak of them, might have reached in the process of the discussion an unexceptionable understanding of Paul's view of the Christian life, as the as yet uncompleted product of the combined operation of the forgiving and renewing grace of God; and along with that a recognition of the substantial faithfulness of the reproduction of Paul's view in the teaching of the Reformation. Their approximation to such an understanding is at times so close that their assertions of divergences from it strike the reader almost as mere eccentricities. But the main elements of what Ritschl had taught, they continue to repeat up to the end, in one form or another, although, to speak the whole truth, often with more or less complete evacuation of Ritschl's meaning, while yet always making a show of deference to his authority. We have reference here especially to the assertion that Paul does not relate justification to the sins of Christians, and indeed does not regard these sins as very serious, certainly not as serious enough to qualify their sense of their own ethical worth; and that on the other hand, the Reformers so focused attention on the perpetual sinning of Christians as to submerge all sense of or indeed effort after ethical growth in a constant search for forgiveness, so that the entirety of Christian experience was summed up for them in the sense of repeated forgiveness. The debate, of course, did not lie wholly in the hands of the Ritschlians, although

⁵³ P. 84.

they were perhaps the most active parties to it: and it must be confessed that too many of those who entered it with a view to defending the Reformation doctrine, taught, instead, a doctrine which seems to have become traditional in the Lutheran churches as the Reformation doctrine, but which, if conceived as such, would go far towards justifying the Ritschlian strictures upon the teaching of the Reformers.

An example is supplied even by the very carefully guarded discussion of Ernst Cremer.⁵⁴ It is Cremer's fundamental postulate that "forgiveness of sins" is "the whole of Christianity, full salvation."⁵⁵ And "because the forgiveness of sins is God's whole salvation, perfect salvation, the faith which apprehends it in Christ is perfection."⁵⁶ "It becomes intelligible now why faith in Christ is perfection; it is because God's forgiveness of sins is God's whole salvation, in which God's saving will comes to its goal; believers are perfect because Christ's saving work is perfect."⁵⁷ "By the designation of the believer as perfect, it is emphasized that we have in Christ in the forgiveness of sins all that we need from God." The terms perfection, perfect, are, of course, used in these declarations in a non-moral sense. We read:⁵⁸ "The idea that under Christian perfection the final result of the so-called process of sanctification is to be understood has no point of attachment in the New Testament." Again:⁵⁹ "The perfection of the Christian is nowhere represented as the goal that is to be attained by him"; "it is not a particular stage of the Christian life."

If this be so, naturally the question becomes very pressing, In what relation does the moral life stand to this experience of forgiveness through faith? Cremer raises the

⁵⁴ *Ueber die Christliche Vollkommenheit*, 1899. Compare also L. Clasen, *Z TH K*, X. 1900, pp. 439ff. and Beyreis, *NKZ*, XII. 1901, pp. 507 ff. 621 ff.

⁵⁵ P. 40.

⁵⁶ P. 22.

⁵⁷ P. 21.

⁵⁸ P. 22.

⁵⁹ P. 37.

question in the first instance in this form:⁶⁰ "If the Christian has his perfection in faith in Christ, and that, just because he has in Him forgiveness of sins,—if forgiveness of sins is the whole of salvation—in what interest can then the moral requirement be made seriously effective?" In reply he tells us that "the moral relation cannot be so separated from the religious, from faith, that a faith would be conceivable which does not at the same time postulate and bring with it a moral relation:" "faith in Christ is not possible without our attitude to the world being decisively influenced." It is absurd to talk of going to Christ for forgiveness of sin without a realization of the evil that sin is, and a renunciation of it. The one is involved in the other. That is all true enough, but it leaves us only greatly desiring to be free from sin, without telling how our deliverance from it may be accomplished. We are carried a step further, however, when we are told that⁶¹ "the salvation present in Christ is of such a nature that it cannot be accepted in faith except with such a transformation." But we will let Cremer himself expound why and how this is so:—"Even the minimum of religious understanding is lacking when forgiveness of sins becomes suspected of being a dispensation from the moral requirement. It is a favorite notion—especially where moral perfection, or at least completeness, 'sanctification,' is demanded with emphasis—that on deliverance from the guilt of sin, deliverance from its power *follows* as a *second* divine gift and human task. The power of sin cannot be more strongly experienced than when sin is experienced as guilt. Precisely in the sense of guilt does sin exercise its enslaving dominion, and when the sense of guilt is lacking sin is not felt as an enslaving power and therefore the power of sin is broken when guilt is removed. Forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit are therefore one act; God forgives sins when (*indem*) He gives the Spirit: the forgiveness of sins is in

⁶⁰ P. 22.

⁶¹ Pp. 22-23.

itself the establishment of communion with God; a forgiveness which was not the establishment of communion with God, gift of the Spirit, would be no forgiveness. Because, however, forgiveness is the gift of the Spirit, essentially the entirety of salvation is to be recognized in it. In one divine act the power of sin is, therefore, broken along with the removal of its guilt; in faith and in the forgiveness of sins morality is inseparably bound to religion and morality proceeds inseparately out of religion. The establishment of the relation to God is the removal of the relation to sin; in the instant in which the man is bound to God, he is no longer bound to sin; the forgiveness of sins means that the one power replaces the other; if sin has power over men, so also has God, who takes man into fellowship with Himself, power which becomes active in the same instant in which man yields himself to Him. In turning to God, the relation to sin is immediately broken; compare the exposition of Paul in Rom. vi" . . . and so forth.

The scope of this exposition is to the effect that forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit as a sanctifying power, are received by the same act of faith. And that is the burden of Cremer's doctrine of the Christian life. "No doubt when faith is preached," he says again,⁶² "sanctification is preached; for faith which delivers from sin is extinguished if it does not avouch its possession. The preaching of forgiveness and it alone is itself the preaching of sanctification." All this is true, and is important, and as far as it goes is well put. What is lacking in it is any real explanation of how the moral life proceeds out of forgiveness, how justification necessarily carries with it sanctification. We are told that the two go together and must go together: we are told that the same faith receives both: we are told that the new relation to God involved in faith brings renewal with it, with inevitable certainty. But we are not shown how the two are immediately connected inwardly. They find their union apparently in their common relation to

⁶² P. 40.

faith, or in their common source in a reconciled God, but not at all in an immediate relation to one another. And therefore Cremer's insistence that the "forgiveness of sins is the whole of Christianity, full salvation" remains unjustified, and provokes contradiction, as, despite his asseverations of the inseparable connection—involution, if you will—of moral renewal with it, leaving the ethical side of the Christian life inadequately recognized.

The tendency which seems to be guardedly suggested by Cremer comes to its full expression in an interesting article by Karl Schmidt published in the *New Church Journal* in 1905.⁶³ If we read him aright, sanctification with Schmidt consists really in a constantly repeated, or renewed justification; so that it might be said with the fullest meaning that in justification the entirety of sanctification is included. His apparent meaning is not merely that justifying faith brings sanctification also with it, which would be true; but that it brings complete sanctification—perfection—with it all at once. Thus every justified man is perfect; and, the extremes meeting, Schmidt and Wernle might seem to clasp hands. But Schmidt explains that he means this only "in principle"—a phrase very *caviare* to the whole Ritschlian circle. The justified man is sanctified only in beginnings, which will however certainly complete themselves in the end—provided of course that he stays justified. For he may sin; but if he sins that is because his faith has failed; and, faith failing, so does his justification. The only remedy in this condition is to refresh, renew, regain faith. Faith may, no doubt, fail not only measurably but entirely; and then we have fallen wholly out of grace. In every man without exception, however, it fails measurably over and over again. The life of the Christian is conceived thus as a continuous series of failures and renewals of faith—that is to say, of justification, and also of sanctification. This gives to it the aspect of alternations of complete sinfulness and complete sanctification; and in these alternations the

⁶³ *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, XVI. pp. 719-771.

Christian life is lived out. In this construction certainly the necessity of moral effort has dropped out of sight, and no place seems to be left for moral growth. Whatever morality the Christian has, comes to him without effort; and his life-history is marked, not by increasing firmness of moral purpose and strength of moral energy, to say nothing of compass of moral attainments, but only by the aimless and endless systole and diastole of his ethical vicissitudes.

If the discussions of Cremer and Schmidt take a somewhat wide range, and touch on the specific controversy about "miserable-sinner Christianity" only somewhat incidentally, the two dissertations of the Pomeranian pastor, Max Meyer, have no other reason for their existence than that controversy affords them, and make it their sole aim to test the exegetical basis and to review the conclusions of Wernle and his coadjutors. The first of these dissertations, which bears the title of *The Christian's Sin according to Paul's Letters to the Corinthians and Romans*,⁶⁴ confines itself strictly to the testimony of these Epistles to Paul's attitude to the sins of Christians in general. The special question of what role sin plays in the life of the Apostle himself is reserved for the second dissertation, which is entitled, *The Apostle Paul as Miserable Sinner*.⁶⁵ The two together thus cover the ground, and seek by an independent examination of the sources to reach a well-founded judgment on Paul's attitude towards sin in the life of Christians. The three things in the Christian life, as reflected to us from the pages of the Epistles to the Corinthians and Romans, on which Meyer lays stress, are its principial break with sin, its continued involvement with sin, and its progressive conquest of sin. "The Christian life," says he, therefore, is "at once both a being and a becoming, a possessing and an acquiring, an enjoying and a longing, a jubilation and a

⁶⁴ *Die Sünde der Christen, nach Pauli Briefen an die Korinther und Römer*, 1902.

⁶⁵ *Der Apostel Paulus als armer Sünder. Ein Beitrag zur paulinischen Hamartialogie*, 1903.

groaning."⁶⁶ The principal break with sin which has taken place is not undervalued. It is even said that "if sinning once belonged to the nature of man, it has become for the Christian henceforth unnatural."⁶⁷ But neither is it obscured that the break with sin is as yet only principal. "The new creature is nevertheless only one in principle, because one in the making."⁶⁸ "The new life is an inner, a central life, that does not yet dominate in its birth the periphery of the old life. . . . The Christian life needs therefore development in the periphery and is accordingly thought of by Paul as a process of completing and unfolding."⁶⁹ In expounding the Sixth chapter of Romans, Meyer insists that it deals not with an instantaneous transaction merely but with a continuous activity. The question to which it is an answer is, Shall we continue in sin? The thing deprecated is that we may live in sin. The thing approved is that we should walk in newness of life. The passage of the discussion from the indicative to the imperative presents therefore no difficulty. "The new life is thus laid upon the baptized person as his continuous task. And herein it is plainly declared that Paul looked upon the new life of the Christian as an uninterrupted process, proceeding on the ground of a single inner fact."⁷⁰

The Christian life is therefore not merely a gift but also a task, not merely *Gabe*, but *Aufgabe*. "What has come into existence as a once for all determinate experience at the entrance into the Christian state, is to pervade the whole Christian life as a perpetual task."⁷¹ The whole Christian life: there is even a hint that the parousia itself will not find the task completed. At least, when in commenting on I Cor. i. 8 Meyer declares: "That, then, the moral develop-

⁶⁶ *Die Sünde der Christen*, p. 77.

⁶⁷ P. 78, appealing for support to Lütgert, *Sündlosigkeit und Vollkommenheit*, 1897, pp. 38f and Beck, *Vorlesungen über christliche Ethik*, 1892, I. pp. 244-252.

⁶⁸ P. 64.

⁷⁰ P. 79.

⁷¹ P. 79.

ment of the Christian has its crown in sinlessness at the day of the parousia, the Apostle has not taught,”⁷² he does not make it clear that he has that passage only in mind. On the contrary, there is some appearance that he intends the declaration, though occasioned by the exposition of this particular passage, to have general validity. The remark is directed against Gottschick’s assertion⁷³ that the only difference between Paul and Luther in the matter of the Christian’s growth reduces to this: “that Paul hopes for the presence of perfection at the judgment day, while Luther, who understands perfection in the absolute sense, holds it to be unattainable.” There underlies this assertion Gottschick’s notion that Paul does not treat anything as sin among Christians except gross vices, while Luther has attained to a deeper and more refined sense of what is sinful. This notion is undoubtedly wrong. But Meyer is as certainly wrong when he seeks to remove the difference asserted to exist between Luther and Paul with reference to the state of Christians at the parousia, by denying that Paul expected Christians to be perfect “in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.” Such an expectation, he says, “is already excluded by I Cor. vi., where Paul has recognized sin as an inevitable evil, under which the Christian community suffers.” The reference here appears to be wrong, but it is the general assertion founded on it which interests us. According to it, it is Paul’s doctrine that sin is an unfailing evil from which Christians suffer: it is a thing that stays by them always, from which they will never be free. If, when they stand before the Judge at the last day they are “unreprovable,” that is only, now Meyer continues, because they stand there in Christ Jesus and God is faithful and will fulfil the promise of their call. This remark is just, and it is no doubt a just exposition of I Cor. i. 8. But it does not follow that Paul does not teach that the conformation of Christians to their Lord, however slowly it may

⁷² P. 47.

⁷³ *Z TH K.* VII. 446.

have proceeded, will be completed at the last day. This he teaches elsewhere with great clearness (e.g. I Thess. iii. 13, v. 23), and it is a part of his general system, the absence of which would throw it into confusion.⁷⁴

We have laid some stress on Meyer's representation that in Paul's teaching sin is "an inevitable evil" (*unausbleibliches Uebel*) in the Christian life, because he also represents that, according to Paul, sinlessness is possible to Christians. Possible, not actual; but though not actual, yet possible. Before that great experience which we call conversion, a man was under the necessity of sinning: after it, "the Christian need sin no more."⁷⁵ "The possibility of not permitting sin to occur, is, of course, present for the pneumatic."⁷⁶ Expounding Rom. vi. 12, Meyer says: "The 'obeying the lusts' need no longer occur in the Christian life. The Apostle does not mean by this, however, 'that the Christian leads a life no longer accessible to any sin (Holtzmann). The *non posse non peccare* has no doubt ceased for the Christian, but it has not therefore already come with him to the *non posse peccare*, but at most to the *posse non peccare*." We would gladly lay hold of the qualification "at most" as exhibiting at least a certain hesitation in Meyer's mind: but we fear he will not permit us to do so. He means to assert sinlessness to be possible to Christians, although illustrated by no single example. Or rather, as we shall soon find that we have to say, by only a single example. For Meyer finds a single example in Paul himself. Were it not for this one exception we should have to say that a possibility which is never actualized is no possibility—there must be something to render it impossible if in such a multitude of instances it is never actualized. In

⁷⁴ Cf. the good note by T. C. Edwards on I Cor. i. 8: "It by no means implies that a Christian can be, as Meyer says, morally defective at the day of judgment (cf I Thess. v. 23). Rather it implies that the end of this aeon will be determined by moral reasons. The course of history is a moral judgment and the cosmic development depends on that of the individual Christians."

⁷⁵ P. 78.

⁷⁶ P. 79.

the presence of this one exception we can only say that the possibility must be a very slight one which in so many instances has been actualized only once. Meyer's zeal in the matter is an ethical one, and is grounded in his doctrine of the will and its function in the Christian life. What has happened to the Christian at conversion is, in his view, that his will has been freed from bondage to sin, and his destiny placed in his own hands. He may sin, if he chooses; and he need not sin unless he chooses. He may sin fatally if he chooses; or he may refrain from all sinning whatever if he chooses. He stands before the two ways and can walk as he will. If he has the *posse non peccare*, he has equally the *posse peccare*—the *non posse peccare* and the *non posse non peccare* would be equally derogatory to his manhood; for has not the Spirit made him *free*? Accordingly we are told that "it is not unthinkable for Paul that even the Christian should live after the flesh,"⁷⁷ and that "the eventual turning of the Christian *in malam partem* is not at all excluded."⁷⁸ Of course it is not unthinkable either that the Christian should live after the Spirit; that is his quality. And of course he may conceivably live wholly after the Spirit. But here we are called up again, for in the very act of drawing the parallel out in detail Meyer interposes:⁷⁹ "Therefore this conflict cannot possibly find its conclusion within the sphere of this life. And the Apostle has not taught that Christians stand at the end of their Christian development sinless. 'Grace' remains for them always the last word. The sinlessness of the Christian lies therefore on the other side of the earthly existence."⁸⁰ And yet Paul was sinless! The one thing, meanwhile, of which Meyer is most sure, is that what the Spirit does is just to make us formally free; and that He is therefore not to be thought of as an "overmastering power" which acts like a "natural force of a higher order," so that "life in the Spirit is to

⁷⁷ P. 70.

⁷⁸ P. 71.

⁷⁹ P. 80.

⁸⁰ P. 80.

proceed infallibly with the necessity of nature." The language here is, of course, exaggerated. It is chosen with a view to repelling the representations of Karl and Wernle. But, the exaggeration having been eliminated, there is an element of Paul's teaching of the first importance, recognized at this point by Karl and Wernle, which Meyer has not allowed for.

When Meyer comes to deal formally with the question, why Paul had nothing explicit to say to the Corinthians of the forgiveness of their sins, committed since conversion, he is more successful on the destructive than on the constructive side. He has no difficulty in showing that there is no exegetical ground for the assertion that Paul connects the forgiveness of sins so closely with baptism as to treat the merits of Christ as available only for pre-baptismal sins.⁸¹ And he has as little difficulty in showing that the attempts to interpret Paul as reckoning as sins only the gross vices into which he could count on his Christians not falling, does not bear the test of either the exegesis of Paul's words or of the recorded facts. He is quite within the warrant of his evidence when he declares that so far from not requiring his Christians to realize his high ideal in their lives, Paul strenuously demanded its realization by them as their obligatory task, and reckoned it sin in them when their life in the smallest respect failed to correspond with it.⁸² When it comes, however, to adducing definite texts in which the forgiveness of the current sins of Christians is declared, Meyer does not appear to have made his selection with particular success. He is led therefore to suggest that Paul made only a sparing use of express references to the consolation of forgiveness, no doubt for a pedagogic reason—these raw young Christians were less in need of consolation for sins grieved over than of correction for sins indulged in. In the end he falls back, very wisely, on the general consideration that "the forgiveness of sins" that is to say

⁸¹ P. 33.

⁸² P. 35.

that forgiveness of sins which is justification, "has with Paul the value of a permanent possession," so that the question, which it is asserted Paul never raised, how the Christian when he sins, receives forgiveness, obtains this as its proper answer: In the same way that he received forgiveness on becoming a Christian.⁸³ He has no difficulty, of course, in showing,⁸⁴ that justification in the Epistle to the Romans is treated as introducing once for all into grace, and, as H. Cremer puts it, looks both forward and backward in the great context of salvation, binding together past, present and future into one. "God's justifying judgment (explains Cremer more fully),⁸⁵ "is a continuous, permanent one, to which, therefore, even the pardoned sinner can only daily appeal afresh, for daily new and yet abiding forgiveness of his sin and guilt." It admits of no doubt that according to Paul, justification is salvation and therefore dominates with the effects of salvation all the subsequent life of the Christian. And now, having reached this point, Meyer turns the argument around⁸⁶ and urges that this alone proves that Paul looked upon Christians as still sinning. For why should he lay such weight on the continuous importance for the Christian life of precisely justification, unless there were continuous sinning for which this justification is needed?

This argument from justification to the universal sinfulness of Christians admits of greater elaboration than is given it in this place, and receives it in the second of Meyer's dissertations. The very essence of this doctrine is that men have no righteousness of their own, but only that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is of God on faith (Phil. iii. 9). That this means not only that our sole dependence is on the righteousness of God received when we believed, but also that we continue through life so far in the same condition as when we believed, that we never

⁸³ P. 37.

⁸⁴ P. 54.

⁸⁵ *Paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre*, 1899, p. 366.

⁸⁶ P. 56.

have any righteousness of our own on which we can depend, is clear from the eschatological reference in Phil. iii. 9-11. It was not once only that Paul and his Christians had "no confidence in the flesh"; they never had or could have confidence in the flesh, and least of all when it was a matter of entering into participation of Christ's resurrection. It has its significance that precisely in this passage Paul proceeds to declare himself not a consummator but only a viator. He has not attained, but is pressing on. The life that is lived here below is lived not by sight but by faith. Accordingly he characterizes it in Gal. ii. 20 as a life in the flesh, lived in faith, faith in his Redeemer. The question, no doubt, arises whether the phrase "in the flesh" in this passage implies sin. H. A. W. Meyer says it does not: "The context does not convey any reference to the ethical character of the 'flesh' (as *sedes peccati*)."⁸⁷ Max Meyer says it does; and on the whole we think him right.⁸⁸ "Already," he writes,⁸⁸ "that 'flesh' and 'Spirit' are associated in the passage as two inimical powers, which stand in diametrical contradiction with one another, proves that the Apostle did not consider himself sinless. . . . The 'flesh' with him too is still *sedes et fomes peccati*, and is active in the 'lusts,' . . . And that Paul has even here thought of the sin inhering in his 'flesh' in which he knows himself involved, in spite of his most intimate *unio mystica* with Christ, we learn from this—that he, so long as he lives 'in the flesh,' knows himself permanently united by faith to Him who loved him and gave Himself for him. It is Jesus' love for sinners on which he stays himself in his life of faith. . . . According to this passage Paul not only felt the need of comfort and new forgiveness but actually always afresh appropriated in faith the forgiveness of sins in Christ." Meyer, then, adduces Col. i. 14, Eph. i. 7, "we *have* forgiveness of sins," and calling attention to the present tense, declares that these passages show that Paul knew, for his own person also, "a

⁸⁷ See also Mühlau, as cited p. 231. On the other hand Windisch, as cited, 156, holds with H. A. W. Meyer.

⁸⁸ *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1904, 7, col. 203.

remissio quotidiana.” G. Hollmann simply scouts this use of these passages, and certainly it does bear some appearance of overstraining them. But at least the passages show that the forgiveness of sins was a blessing enjoyed, alike by Paul and his Christians, as a continuous possession, and that this forgiveness must be taken sufficiently inclusively to embrace all the sins that existed for him and them. If we cannot quite say that the passages prove that they were continuously sinning, we must at least say that they do prove that the grace of forgiveness was looked upon by them as the fundamental blessing on which they rested their whole lives long.

Meyer himself, it is to be observed, does not look upon these passages as proving that Paul and his Christians thought of themselves as continually sinning. They prove only, in his view, that Paul and his Christians thought of themselves as continually sinful. He argues strongly, as we have seen, that all others than Paul were continually sinning. But he singles Paul out as the one man who has ever lived who has realized the possibility that belongs to all Christians, of not actually sinning,—a judgment which seems rather ungenerous to John and Peter and James and the rest. Paul, says he,⁸⁹ “is the greatest, next to Him who can be compared to none other.” “He not only preached to his Christians, but he lived out before them, how far the Christian can advance in the battle for sanctification.” If this is to be taken as meaning what it says, Paul is presented to us as illustrating the utmost moral possibility of humanity; we may just as well look upon his person as read his precepts, if we wish to learn the full duty of the Christian in the sanctification of his life. He is more completely our example than Christ Himself, because Christ went beyond,—Paul only to the extreme limits of—our possibilities. There are attainments in Christ’s life in which we cannot follow him; there are no attainments possible to us whose model we do not find in Paul. It is needless to say that

⁸⁹ *Der Apostel Paulus als arme Sünder*, p. 585.

Paul does not present himself to us as such a universal example, when he calls on his readers to be imitators of him as he was of Christ Jesus; and it is equally needless to say that he is not brought before us in his epistles as such a universal example. Such overstraining of Paul's language is not necessary that we may do justice to his greatness, or to the really divine element in his life and in his work. Meyer is quite right when he insists on the unity of his consciousness and refuses to separate Paul the man from Paul the Apostle,⁹⁰ and to pass differing moral judgments on the two. Paul was as a man what he was as Apostle: the apostleship was the sphere in which this man functioned. And after all said, Paul's apostleship was not self-sought, and was not prosecuted in his own strength. He was called by God to it, and sustained by God in it, in a definitely supernatural manner. It is not surprising that he was conscious of having done the work of the apostleship faithfully. He praises his work as well done: the praise he gives it is of course less praise of himself than of the God who strengthened him: but even so, his self-praise does not involve a claim of personal perfection even in his work. In I Cor. xv. 9 he puts himself in point of fitness for his office below all the other Apostles—though he was under no illusions as to the shortcomings of some of them; and if he asserts that he has labored more abundantly than all, he ascribes that to the pure grace of God. In Eph. iii. 8 he describes himself as less than the least of all the saints, without any obvious reference to his pre-Christian life,—and he knew the saints. When he calls himself in I Tim. i. 15 (if the adduction be allowed) the chief of sinners, it is not so certain that the reference is solely to his pre-Christian sins. It is not a boastful sense of his own strength, but a humble dependence on God's grace, which after all forms the basis of Paul's self-consciousness, and, as Meyer very properly remarks,⁹¹ "if it is the triumph of the divine power in him which rules the Apostle's whole self-consciousness,

⁹⁰ P. 41.

⁹¹ P. 20.

then, his boasting, in which his self-consciousness finds its strongest expression, becomes intelligible; and the appearance of Paul's making himself guilty of the sin of proud exaltation, vanishes."

Meyer is no more insistent that Paul was free from actual sinning—that is his concession to his opponents in the "miserable-sinner" controversy—than he is that he remained always sinful in his 'flesh,' which is his concession to Paul's own teaching. He argues elaborately⁹² that although Paul always felt the impulse to sin and longed to be free from it, yet he never fell into sins of act. He bore therefore in the battle with sin the physiognomy of conquerer, and step by step drove it ever from the field. But Meyer is very strenuous in asserting the unbroken presence in Paul of this sinful "flesh." As he puts his conclusion formally:⁹³ "So far as the material at our disposal tells us, it must pass as an axiom that Paul in his Christian life knew sin very well, but had no acquaintance with sin in our ordinary sense. We can speak then, with reference to Paul only of a *peccatum habituale*, not here ever of a *peccatum actuale*. Apart from the possibilities of sins of inadvertence, weakness and ignorance, it was 'concupiscence' which with Paul was the constitutive characteristic of what was especially signified to him by 'sin.' On its account the Apostle has to prosecute with reference to himself continually, that 'discerning' of I Cor. xi. 31, 'cleansing' of II Cor. vii. 1. This 'concupiscence' was the constant occasion why Paul over and over again cried out with yearning for his deliverance from his sinful flesh." A position like this is scarcely more intelligible in itself than it is defensible from the records. So sharp a separation as is made between the underlying sinful nature and the body of sinful acts seems untenable. There is no sinful nature which is not active; and the activities within and the activities without are scarcely capable of such sharp division. So certainly as the *operari* follows the *esse*, so certain is it that as long as the *peccatum habituale*

⁹² Pp. 43, 44.

⁹³ P. 51.

exists the *peccatum actuale* occurs. So far from saying that the *peccatum habituale* may lie in the background and show itself in no act, we must rather say that so long as it lies in the background it must of necessity show itself in every act. Its existence in Paul makes him in the fullest sense of the word a "miserable sinner," incapable of not sinning, because incapable of being in his acts anything but himself. Of course, if all that is meant is that Paul did not commit murder or adultery, did not steal and rob, then that is true. But we should not forget the probing touch of the Sermon on the Mount, which is Paul's touch too, as Meyer fully understands—witness his decisive repulsion of the attempts of Gottschick and Jacoby to attribute to Paul a coarser standard. And Meyer should not forget either, by the way, that according to him, Paul prayed, "Forgive us our trespasses." And it might even be worth while to remember the sharp saying of Samuel Rutherford about "the world's negative holiness—no adulterer, no murderer, no thief, no cozener,"—which, he says, "maketh men believe they are already glorified saints." It is not necessary to do those things in order to be a "miserable sinner;" nor does the absence of such things from the life constitute us sinless.

We have just seen Meyer attributing to Paul knowledge and use of the Lord's Prayer and we have seen formerly the same thing done by Juncker. It was inevitable that sooner or later some one would enter the controversy about the sins of Christians from this angle. This was at length done by G. Bindemann in a book entitled *The Prayer for Daily Forgiveness of Sins in Jesus' Proclamation of Salvation and in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul*,⁹⁴ published in 1902. It cannot be said that this new mode of approach brought much gain for the particular debate in progress. It was already generally allowed that Jesus did not contemplate sinless followers, so that in the first part of his discussion Bindemann can give us only a systematic arrangement of generally accepted facts. In the second part, he manages

⁹⁴*Das Gebet um tägliche Vergebung der Sünden in der Heilswerk-
ungung Jesu und in der Briefen des Apostels Paulus* 1902.

to review all the main topics which the debate had thrown into prominence but he does this outside of his specific subject. He is compelled to allow that there is the slenderest direct ground for attributing to Paul knowledge and use of the Lord's Prayer, and indeed he bases his own conclusion that it was known to Paul ultimately on general considerations, rather than on specific references to it. He can even write:⁹⁵ "No express references to the several petitions of the Lord's Prayer are found, and it may seem that the whole spirit of that prayer is alien to the Apostle: not petition, but thanksgiving becomes the Christian. It has even been possible to maintain that the Lord's directions as to prayer as they are presented in the Lord's Prayer are altogether unknown to the Apostle."⁹⁶ And in fact, for one to whom it is not from the outset on other grounds a historical impossibility that Paul should have had no knowledge of this important piece of tradition of Jesus, such knowledge is not to be indisputably proved from the Epistles of Paul."

Already from this passage we perceive that the question with reference to Paul's prayers takes a wider range than merely his knowledge and use of the Lord's Prayer. In his references to prayer, we are told in this same context, the prayer of petition in general falls notably into the background in comparison with the prayer of thanksgiving, and petitions for forgiveness remain unmentioned even when the prayer of petition is spoken of. "Here Paul nowhere mentions, no matter how much occasion there was for it, the prayer for forgiveness; he neither bears witness to it for himself, nor does he recommend it to others with unmistakable clearness. This could be expected; since he is writing to congregations in which open sins, serious faults, lay publicly in sight. Even his intercessions for his congregations, the contents of which he incidentally communicates, do not enable us to determine that he prays for the forgiveness of their guilt. He prays for the growth of faith, the

⁹⁵ P. 10.

⁹⁶ The reference is to Wernle, as cited, p. 50, to which is added Gunkel, *Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*², 1899, p. 61.

increase of knowledge, that they may receive in greater fulness the gifts which they already have." At a later point in the discussion this same line of remark is resumed. We read:⁹⁷ "Petition also, then, does not fail in Paul's own prayer-life. But in all the intimations concerning the content of his prayers all reference to prayers for the forgiveness of sins is lacking. We might repeatedly expect an exhortation to the congregation not to forget the prayer for forgiveness; most naturally, say, at the end of Galatians or Corinthians; but precisely here there is lacking even that general requirement of prayer, such as is found in I Thessalonians, Romans, Philippians, Ephesians, Colossians. Other passages seem to show directly that the daily prayer for forgiveness, such as is recommended in the Lord's Prayer, does not at least take a prominent place in the Apostle's circle of ideas. In Col. iii. 12 cf. Eph. iv. 32, the readers are required to forgive one another when they have suffered injury the one from the other. But as the motive for such a willingness to forgive, there is no indication that only under this condition will their prayer for forgiveness of their own sins be heard of God—though that would be sufficiently naturally suggested by Mat. vi. 12, 14 f., Mark xi. 25, 26, Luke xi. 4. Only the fact in their own past is recalled, that their sins *have been* forgiven to his readers, the fact of washing away their sins which occurred in baptism."

Having thus sharpened the problem to the utmost Binde-mann makes it his task to show in detail that despite the fact that mention of the prayer for forgiveness falls into the background in Paul's letters, Paul's whole system of teaching supposes and demands it. In that system the guilt of sin takes the most prominent place and on every page of his writings it is pre-eminently the guilt of sinning which is presupposed. He will not even permit it to be said that, justification being presupposed, it is, with reference to the Christian life, the power of sin which takes the place in the

⁹⁷ P. 62.

foreground. Having pointed out that, according to Paul, wherever the "flesh" is, there is sin, that therefore all Christians still sin, and, still sinning, are still in need of forgiveness, he continues:⁹⁸ "according to all this, it should be admitted that the prayer for the forgiveness of sins takes a place in the piety of Paul of similar importance to that which it takes in Jesus' proclamation of salvation."

Nevertheless (he proceeds to reason) precisely the significance which the contrast of "flesh" and "Spirit" with Christians possesses in the theology of Paul seems to many to lead to something different. There is an appearance as if, for the Apostle, in the estimate of sin in the Christian life, the idea of its *power* may stand in the foreground, while the idea of the *guilt* produced by it in God's sight retires into the background. Attention has accordingly been called to the fact that Paul never speaks of the importance for Christians of the forgiveness of sins obtained by Christ. Justification, forgiveness of sins, appear rather, it is said, as a possession, which believers have from the beginning on. On the other hand, it is said, the demand that Christians shall withstand the power of sin in the power of the Spirit is constantly repeated. In the description of the Christian life, interest in emancipation from the power of sin predominates with the Apostle. Here, therefore, the Apostle's teaching concerning the Spirit, which contains the really new and fruitful ideas of the Apostle, obtains the upper hand, while the juridical circle of ideas, which embraces the doctrine of justification, of faith, and so forth, seems confined wholly to the fact, lying in the past, of entrance into the Christian life. The Epistle to the Romans is, it is said, the proof of this; whereas the first five chapters are wholly dominated by the doctrine of justification, in the succeeding three which describe the life of the Christian, it is only the walk in the Spirit that is discussed. Thus the recession of prayers for forgiveness is explained, so it is said, by the concentration of the Apostle's interest on emancipation from

⁹⁸ P. 89.

the power of sin, whereas emancipation from its guilt, by the fundamental forgiveness of sins, which occurs once for all, is guaranteed once for all.

To this plausible representation Bindemann replies that not only does it fail to apprehend the close relations in which Paul's doctrines of justification and of the gift of the Spirit stand to one another; but it attributes to the Apostle a separation between the power and the guilt of sin, which would have been impossible to him. It would have been impossible to the Apostle to think of the power of sin, without at the same time thinking of its guilt. "It was far too serious an estimation of sin, which came to the Apostle out of his faith in God's forgiveness of sin on the ground of Christ's death, for the consciousness of guilt not necessarily to awaken with new sharpness along with the thought of Christ's act, on the occurrence of every sin that was committed in the Christian life." "Therefore," Bindemann says in conclusion,⁹⁹ "it is for Paul, too, wholly self-evident, that the Christian, considering his sin, necessarily needs the forgiveness of its guilt, and the assurance that this new sin also is forgiven and his communion with God is no longer disturbed." By such lines of thought as this, Bindemann supposes that he has shown that the preaching of Paul contains all the presuppositions which require of Christians prayer for forgiveness and manifests the sameness of the faith of Paul with that of Jesus. On this ground he thinks he may assert that Paul knew the Lord's Prayer and used it in the same sense in which Jesus gave it. "It can no longer seem strange that Paul never elsewhere"—than in the one passage in which he supposes it referred to—"mentions it, and does not oftener require it. We may hold it to be accident, if the few occasional writings which have come down to us from Paul, do not give us clearer information in the matter."

Ludwig Ihmels' excellent conference address on *The*

⁹⁹ P. 90.

*Daily Forgiveness of Sins*¹⁰⁰ occupies much the same standpoint with Bindemann's book. It itself sums up the result of its discussion in these words:¹⁰¹ "We live by daily forgiveness and we praise God's mercy that we may live by it." But it adds at once: "To be sure, that we are sinners is no part of the Gospel and what we praise God's mercy for is not that we never have as yet overcome sin." That the address is preoccupied with this apologetical aspect of the question is due in part to the gibing tone of the assailants of the doctrine presented in it, and in part, no doubt, also to the circumstances that it was spoken to a company of pastors, and has as its object to advise them in their dealings with somewhat formal penitents. It is more concerned therefore to avoid appearing to give license to sinning among the indifferent, as something natural to the Christian life, which it would be useless to strive against, than it is to encourage the despairing with the assurance that their sins, though many, may and will be forgiven them.

The address opens by representing opponents as saying, "Must we sin, then, in order to be orthodox?"¹⁰² Why preach the persistence of sinning among Christians and the permanent continuance of their imperfection? The answer is, in the first instance, says Ihmels, because it is true. It is also true, of course, that it is only half the truth, and the other half must be insisted on, too. And the other half is that "wherever personal Christianity exists there necessarily is also a radical break with sin."¹⁰³ The Christian is not to be expected simply to accept his lot and adjust himself to his continued sinning as to something that has to be endured.¹⁰⁴ And certainly he is not to be exhorted, as some sectaries exhort him, to look on all our sinning as in such

¹⁰⁰ *Die tägliche Vergebung der Sünden: Vortrag gehalten auf der X. Allgemeinen lutherischen Konferenz, zu Lund. 1901.*

¹⁰¹ P. 34.

¹⁰² P. 8. Ihmels says he takes these words from the lips of one of the leaders of the Sanctification Movement, meaning R. Pearsall Smith (*Reden*, p. 99).

¹⁰³ P. 9.

¹⁰⁴ P. 16.

a sense already forgiven as that we need have no concern about it. That is not the attitude of the New Testament writers to the sins of Christians. Nor is it the attitude of the Reformers. The Reformation doctrine of "miserable sinners" is a doctrine of penitent sinners. It has no application to the indifferent or the secure. It offers itself only to those who, broken-hearted in repentance, look to Jesus alone as their compassionate Saviour, and it tells them that for them too Jesus alone is enough. It does not tell them that they are not sinners; that would not be true, and they know it is not true; no one knows himself a sinner like a penitent sinner. It tells them that they are saved sinners,—and that is the most glorious thing it could tell them.

Advising his company of pastors directly as to how the public proclamation of the perpetual forgiveness of sins is to be made, Ihmels speaks as follows:¹⁰⁵ "This is the gospel—that God for the sake of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who gave Himself for our sins and rose again for our justification, will still have communion with sinners. As proclamation of the daily forgiveness of sins, this Gospel takes the form that God will not be prevented from fostering this communion by the continuing imperfection of the Christian state. The gospel, now, belongs, however, only to the sincere. Hence it follows that consolatory preaching of the possibility and actuality of continuous forgiveness, must be accompanied—of course not in the pastoral care of the anxious, but in the general public preaching—with a plain warning against all consciously cherished sin. Consciously cherished sin makes communion with God objectively and subjectively impossible—there can be no doubt of that. Then, however, the proclamation must carefully avoid all appearance of intending to treat the Christian's continuing sin itself as a part of the gospel. It cannot, in other words, seek to quiet the Christian, lamenting over his sin, with the consolation that it cannot be otherwise, and also that it makes little difference."

¹⁰⁵ P. 49.

It will have already been observed that the specialty of Ihmels' treatment of the general subject lies in the emphasis he throws on the duty of overcoming our sins. The forgiveness of our sins is in the interests of our overcoming them, not of our acquiescing in them. In this the whole essence of the gospel lies for him. "The whole Christian life," he says,¹⁰⁶ "in the sense of the Reformation is nothing but an unfolding of the communion with God and the blessedness grounded in forgiveness of sin. Therefore a forgiveness of sins, no matter how truly, as the warranty of communion with God, it may mean the whole salvation, would nevertheless be but a self-contradiction if it did not also deliver the Christian actually from sin." And what is true of the great central act of forgiveness, is true for him also of all the repeated acts of our daily forgiveness. They are in order to our constant advance in overcoming our sins. We are still imperfect; but it is perfection to which we are destined and it is through God's grace, manifested, among other things, in the forgiveness of the sins into which we fall on our way thither, that we are advanced toward it. This is the way Ihmels expresses himself on these matters:¹⁰⁷ "It may be said that among all assertions which are made about sanctification, there is none which is more lacking in Scriptural basis than that view according to which the divine act of justification needs to be supplemented by a later divine act of sanctification. On the other hand the Holy Scriptures certainly know of a growth in faith, which means at the same time a growth in the whole Christian life, and they know also of such Christians as they call in a special sense perfect. But let the Biblical notion of perfection be defined as exactly as it may, there are at any rate three things about which there can be no doubt. First, nothing is meant by it beyond the homely Christian state itself, accessible to all: it is rather a matter simply of perfection in this state. Secondly, the application of this conception to the individual Christian is always intended

¹⁰⁶ Pp. 12, 13.

¹⁰⁷ P. 20.

only in a relative sense. Lastly, this judgment has, moreover, nothing to do with absolute sinlessness."

Perhaps there underlies Ihmels' treatment of the Christian's advance in ethical attainment a somewhat inadequate conception of the mode of the supernatural re-creation of which it is the human manifestation. Like many of his fellows he is very much afraid of ascribing an operation to God analogous, as he would say, to the action of a natural force;¹⁰⁸ and is jealous above all things for "purely voluntary" action on man's part—as if the voluntariness of the human action was in any way curtailed by the underlying recreating or even "leading" action of God. When he comes to describe in detail, however, the process of the Christian's advance, the words in which he does so are at least capable of a thoroughly unexceptionable meaning. The main points in his description are that the Christian's life is a battle against remanent sin, but a battle fought under the initiation of God and with the promise of victory. "According to experience," he adds,¹⁰⁹ "this victory is not in this life a definitive one; the expectation of the complete overcoming of the flesh we connect with the complete deliverance from the obduracy of the world of sin and of death, and our immediate transference under the influence of God 'from face to face'."

Much the same note as is struck by Ihmels is struck by Johannes Hausleiter in another conference address—on *The Christian's Consciousness of Sins*,—delivered in 1904. This address is indeed more intimate in tone than Ihmels', because it deals not with pastoral duty but with personal religion. Having spoken of our vivid memory of past sins, Hausleiter asks whether the change that took place in us "when we believed" has broken off all relation to the "lusts of the flesh" which formerly brought us into sin. "Were that true," he says, "the memory of the past would

¹⁰⁸ E. g. pp. 16-36.

¹⁰⁹ Pp. 22.

¹¹⁰ Published in the *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, 1904, 26 (Jan. 24), coll. 610 ff.

not be so living, so present,—we might say so timeless—as it actually is. The Apostle Paul says, ‘the flesh lusts against the Spirit, the Spirit, however, lusts against the flesh’ (Gal. v. 17). The assertion applies to us, to Christians. We may be preserved now from many actual sins, if we let ourselves be led by the Spirit of God. But so long as we are involved in this body of death the old man does not cease to stir or to move. We have every reason to take heed to these movements and to combat them. When the Apostle gives the exhortation, ‘Walk in the Spirit,’ he does not add the conclusion, ‘And then you will have nothing more to do with the lusts of the flesh,’ but ‘And then you will not *fulfill* the lusts of the flesh.’ There is no longer need to fall into the gross works of the flesh and there should be no falling into them. But the impulse and the provocation to do so remains in our sinful nature, and therefore the necessity of conflict and of watchfulness abides. And therefore there abides the petition: ‘Forgive us our trespasses.’”

Having next deepened our sense of the sinfulness of our misdeeds by showing how they are all specifically sins against God, Hausleiter proceeds: “There stands a declaration in the First Epistle to Timothy which has seemed to many strange. Paul writes here (I Tim. i. 15), that Christ has come into the world to save sinners, and adds: ‘Among whom I *am* a chief one.’ Has he not miswritten? Ought he not to have written, ‘Among whom I *was* a chief one?’ He is certainly already, washed, sanctified, justified; he is a servant of Jesus Christ, and His ambassador to the Gentiles. He has labored more than the others. But that is not his merit, but the merit of grace. Through God’s grace he is what he is. But just because he lives continuously by grace, the knowledge of his sin is ever before him. They condition one another. Because Paul cannot live without the Savior of sinners, he reckons himself permanently among sinners, not among sinners who wish to remain sinners and are far from God, but among those who have experienced overpowering grace but who also know that they need grace

daily. Paul knows himself and his Savior. The Holy Spirit has opened his eyes." "The Christian knows," we read again, "that he is burdened with much more guilt than he himself perceives,—guilt of unrecognized results of earlier sins, still greater guilt of sins of omission in the region of charity. The Christian joins in the prayer of the Psalmist, 'Who can mark how often he fails? Cleanse me from secret faults' (Ps. xix. 13). Should he be willing consciously to increase the burden of guilt lightly? The Christian stands in daily conflict with sins of temperament, with sins of weakness and sins of habit. The grace of God has enough here to bear, to cleanse, to wash away. It were a sacrilege to draw on it deliberately by conscious transgression. God keep us, us Christians, from security! The consciousness of sin, in the earnest sense in which we have described it, is a means of protection."

We have moved into a totally new atmosphere when we turn to Otto Pfleiderer. A lingering relic of the old Tübingen school, an eager forerunner of the new history-of-religion school, he had no more in common with the Ritschlians by whom and with whom the controversy had in the main been carried on, than with their "miserable-sinner" opponents. We shall have to go back to W. A. Karl at the very beginning of the controversy to find anything with which we can compare him, and it goes without saying that Pfleiderer owes nothing to Karl, and that the parallel between the two has its very narrow limits. He takes his start as is his wont from general ethnic conceptions and endeavors to interpret Paul from them, placing in this interest at the foundation of Paul's thought the universal animism of heathen mythology. The book in which Pfleiderer's views on the matter which concern us are given expression, is the second edition of his *Primitive Christianity in its Writings and Teachings*.¹¹¹ The first edition of this work was published late in 1887. The second edition, "thoroughly re-

¹¹¹ *Das Urchristenthum, seine Schriften und Lehren* (1887) 1902.

vised and much enlarged" appeared in 1902;¹¹² and among the changes introduced into it were included the whole animistic background which Pfleiderer now wrote into Paul's doctrine of the Spirit, and especially the completed elaboration of that mystical conception which he had always attributed to Paul's notion of the relation of the Christian to Christ,¹¹³ and on the basis of which he now represents Paul as inconsistent with his fundamental thought in recognizing sin as possible and actual in the Christian life.¹¹⁴

It will be observed that Pfleiderer is entirely willing to allow that Paul holds a supernaturalistic view of the Christian life. He assigns his supernaturalism, however, to an animistic inheritance. This animistic inheritance, nevertheless, has been modified by Paul in two directions. With him all the spirits had coalesced into one Spirit, the Spirit of Christ. And this Spirit operated in the Christian not occasionally only but continuously, and in particular became the productive cause of his whole ethical life. There is a recognition here of Paul's doctrine of the "leading of the Spirit," disparaged no doubt by its connection with animism, but nevertheless admitted in its fundamental elements. Now, Pfleiderer remarks that such a doctrine brings with it certain practical difficulties. "When the Christian life is referred back to a spiritual being of supernatural power, coming into man from without," he argues,¹¹⁵ "the ethical self-determination of the human ego threatens to be suppressed, and the transformation seems to be effected in the

¹¹² An English translation was published in 1906, and the following references are to it.

¹¹³ From the beginning of his occupation with the teaching of Paul (*Paulinismus*, 1873, E T 1877) Pfleiderer had attributed to him a mystical doctrine (which he calls a Mysticism of Faith), discovering the chief of its expressions in the "in Christ" which was afterwards to be exploited by A. Deissmann (see *Paulinismus* pp. 197ff.) On the early form of his doctrine of the Spirit the same reference will suffice, to which may nevertheless be added *The Influence of the Apostle Paul*, 1881, pp. 69 ff. In these early expositions of the "in Christ" and the "Spirit" is to be found the germ of all that Pfleiderer teaches in 1902.

¹¹⁴ Pp. 404 f.

¹¹⁵ P. 390.

inevitable fashion of a process of nature, in which, along with human freedom, guilt and sin would be excluded." That is to say, if we are in the hands of a supernatural power all our own activities must be supposed to be superseded and there must be attributed to the Spirit alone our entire, not merely recreation, but life-manifestation.

Pfleiderer says that Paul, "in his ideal picture of the spiritual life under grace (Rom. vi. and viii.)," does seem to make an approach to "these inferences." "But," he adds, Paul "is practical enough to recognize fully the continuance of sin even in Christians and attributes this to a principle of sin in the flesh which brings the ego into captivity. Over against the abstract ideal of the spiritual man who cannot sin, he sets directly the equally abstract caricature of the carnal man who can do nothing but sin (Rom. vii. 14ff.)." Here we have, he says, "two abstractions which are doubtless meant as the opposite sides of the same condition." They are nevertheless, in Pfleiderer's opinion "in fact mutually exclusive, and in their opposition split the unity of the personal life in a dualistic fashion." He thinks the "difficulty is solved," however, if, following "modern psychology," we interpret Paul in terms of "psychic conditions, motives, determinants of the will, which, as they are developed out of the unity of human nature, are always held together by the unity of personal consciousness in such a way that they form its proper content, the manifold factors of its life activity."

As this is precisely what Paul means and says, without prejudice to his supernaturalism, we can but wonder why a self-contradiction should be thrust upon him only that it may be immediately resolved. The contradiction is resolved, however, in Pfleiderer's view only for himself, not for Paul, and in his further exposition of Paul's teaching as to the Christian life it is pressed to its extremity. "A lofty idealism," we are told,¹¹⁶ "appears in this description of the Christian life. The Christian is no longer in the

¹¹⁶ Pp. 404 ff.

flesh but in the Spirit; he has crucified the flesh with its lusts; the world is crucified to him and he to the world; he is risen with Christ, lives in the Spirit, possesses the Spirit of Christ. Christ himself lives in him instead of his former ego; he is a new creation; his life is hidden with Christ in God; he has become a spiritual man; he is like Christ. That over such a being sin no longer holds sway is self-evident; that is what makes it so difficult to grasp the fact that nevertheless in the actual Christian life sin is still present. The Christian, as Paul describes his character, ought properly no longer to be able to sin, since the divine Spirit is the ruling ego in him, and the sinful flesh is conquered, abolished. Yet Paul is far from drawing this obvious inference from his doctrine of the Spirit. On the contrary, all his epistles testify with what prudence and care he estimates the actual ethical condition of his churches, censures their weakness and sins, and exhorts them to lay aside all evil and contend unremittingly against sin. Spirit and flesh stood in constant strife with one another; and the victory of the Spirit does not come to pass by itself with the unfailing certainty of the laws of nature, but depends on whether the Christian endeavors to walk according to the standard set up by the Spirit, and mortify the deeds of the body, or allows sin again to have dominion over him."

Pfleiderer supposes here that according to Paul the flesh may defeat the Spirit,—that neither justification nor the spirit of sonship secure "unconditionally" the ultimate salvation of the Christian, but that he stands or falls at the last judgment according to his works—which is certainly not Paul's teaching. But he closes the paragraph with a direct declaration that Paul did not, in any case, ignore the sins of Christians, but deals with them at large and in detail. He then proceeds to declare that there is a contradiction, in Paul's presentation of the Christian life, between his doctrine of it as Spirit-led and his doctrine of it as the scene of ethical effort. We are accustomed, he says to correct or to soften this contradiction, by calling in the notion of develop-

ment, process, progressive advance. This is, however, declares Pfeiderer, inconsistent with the supernaturalism of the one aspect of it. "How," he asks, "in relation to the overmastering divine being, is there room for the free self-determination of the human will?"¹¹⁷ But the distinction which Pfeiderer draws here—between divine control and human function—is not Paul's. Paul's preoccupation is with "the flesh" and "the Spirit"—the old instinct to evil, and the new power (certainly divine) to good. What Pfeiderer is asking is, how the creature can resist the creator. His whole preoccupation is with freedom. "Is not the new man on this assumption," he asks, "at bottom a will-less slave of the holy spiritual being in his heart, as the old man was a slave of the demonic sinful being in his flesh (Rom. vi. 16 ff.)? Is he the active and responsible subject of sanctification, or is he only the passive object for the possession of which two hostile powers, the holy spiritual and the fleshly sinful, contend (Gal. v. 17)?" Why take either horn of this dilemma, with its exclusive either—or? Neither represents Paul, who instead of Pfeiderer's Either God or man, says with great clearness, Both (Phil. ii. 12, 13).

It is not without its interest to observe Pfeiderer applying Rom. vii, 14 ff. to the Christian as a description by Paul of one side of the Christian's condition.¹¹⁸ On an earlier page,¹¹⁹ to which he here refers us, he declares of Rom. vii. 25 that it is a "confession which is by no means to be referred to the past of the Apostle before his conversion, but pictures a present and continuous condition." He adds, however, "But of course only as regards the 'natural man,' which continues to exist even in Christians alongside of the supernatural 'pneuma,' and is here portrayed by Paul with the same one-sided abstraction with which he elsewhere

¹¹⁷ P. 407.

¹¹⁸ P. 390.

¹¹⁹ Pp. 734 f. This whole passage is in the second edition added bodily to the statement in the first edition (1887), which closes on a different note.

portrays the new spiritual life of Christians." "Only," says he, "from a combination of the two one-sided pictures,—the dark picture in chapter vii, and the bright picture in chapter viii,—can we gather Paul's complete view of the actual concrete Christian life (Gal. v. 17)." With this background of the dualism of Paul's representation behind him, Pfeiderer can now go on to declare that in Rom. viii., Paul represents believers as set free by the Spirit from all sin, meaning "not merely the removal of the guilt of sin, but also the overcoming of the power of sin." Only—it all depends on our coöperation and after all it is only an abstract picture of one side of the matter, the other side of which we have already read in Ch. vii.

This is not untying the knot; it is not even cutting it; it is leaving it as tightly tied as it was before. The debate could not end in such ambiguities. We find it accordingly returning at once, for better, for worse, to the round assertions of Wernle. Only so was there hope of rescuing these assertions from their impending disintegration. Whether this rescue could in any case be accomplished we may learn by observing Windisch's valiant attempt to accomplish it.

Princeton.

B. B. WARFIELD.

THE NAMES OF GOD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

In the issue of this REVIEW for October, 1919, there was given an induction of the uses in the Koran of the words for Lord and God. In the number for January, 1920, were collected the various designations of the Deity as they are found in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical literature of the Jews up to 135 A.D. In this article appear the lists and enumerations of the names and designations of the Deity that are found in the Scriptures of the Old Testament. In view of the fact that the discussions about the Hexateuch, the Psalter, Jonah, Daniel, and other books, turn largely about the names of the Deity, it is hoped that these and similar collections of data will serve as an indispensable foundation for future scientific criticism of the Old Testament.

In the first part of this article (A), will be found enumerations of the *times* that the more common simple names for God occur in the Old Testament books. In B, are given the enumerations of the composite titles; first a general summary of the *times* of occurrence as in A, and then detailed lists giving the places where they occur. In C are listed certain terms that are employed at times to designate the Deity, such as Holy One and Heaven. In D are given certain remarks and conclusions based on the lists and meant to serve rather as samples for the use of the lists than as an attempt to exhaust the bearings of the induction of titles upon the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament. Theologians and historians as well as critics should be stimulated by these conclusions to further investigations and combinations of the materials here collected.

In view of the facts collected in these three articles (i.e., in the articles in the last October and January numbers of the REVIEW and in this article), a warning may well be sent out to the rising generation of Old Testament critics, that they should be slow about accepting statements of men, however eminent, when their statements are de-

rogatory to the genuineness and accuracy of the books of the Scriptures. When we consider the absolute lack of foundation for the assertions of the late Prof. Cheyne with regard to the names of God in the Psalter, and of the late Dr. Driver with regard to the designation "God of heaven," we may well pause before accepting their mere statements with regard to many other like matters. Scientific criticism must be based on what we *know*, not on what we wish, the facts to be.

A. SIMPLE NAMES FOR GOD

	Jehovah	Adonay	Elohim	Eloah	El	Elyon	Shad-day
PENTATEUCH							
Genesis	146	7	164	0	3	0	1
Exodus	377	6	63	0	1	0	0
Leviticus	304	0	4	0	0	0	0
Numbers	389	1	9	0	9	1	2
Deuteronomy	527	0	38	1	2	0	0
	1743	14	278	1	15	1	3
HEXATEUCH							
P	785	0	95	0	0	0	0
JE	579	14	157	0	13	0	3
D	600	0	40	2	4	1	0
	1964	14	292	2	17	1	3
HISTORICAL BOOKS							
Joshua	225	1	19	0	0	0	0
Judges	179	2	40	0	0	0	0
Ruth	18	0	0	0	0	0	2
1 Samuel	415	0	52	0	0	0	0
2 Samuel	154	0	32	0	2	0	0
1 Kings	253	2	49	0	0	0	0
2 Kings	278	2	49	1	0	0	0
1 Chronicles	172	0	71	0	0	0	0
2 Chronicles	375	0	86	1	0	0	0
Ezra	37	0	13	0	1	0	0
Nehemiah	17	0	28	0	2	0	0
	2123	7	439	2	5	0	2
PROPHETS							
Isa. I-XXXIX	228	21	6	0	5	1	1
Isa. XL-LXVI	193	1	10	1	13	0	0
Jeremiah	670	0	27	0	1	0	0
Ezekiel	193	4	18	0	3	0	1

	Jeho- vah	Ado- nay	Elo- him	Eloah	El	Elyon	Shad- day
Daniel	7	11	72	2	1	0	0
Hosea	43	0	4	0	2	0	0
Joel	29	0	0	0	0	0	1
Amos	59	4	1	0	0	0	0
Jonah	22	0	12	0	0	0	0
Obadiah	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Micah	37	1	1	0	2	0	0
Nahum	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
Habakkuk	12	0	0	2	0	0	0
Zephaniah	32	0	0	0	0	0	0
Haggai	28	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zechariah	143	1	1	0	1	0	0
Malachi	46	1	1	0	2	0	0
	1762	44	153	5	30	1	3
POETICAL BOOKS							
Psalms I.	271	12	20	1	11	4	0
II.	26	14	155	1	5	3	1
III.	43	14	44	0	14	9	0
IV.	101	1	6	0	4	4	1
V.	223	4	9	1	6	1	0
	664	45	234	3	40	21	2
Job	32	1	16	39	54	0	31
Proverbs	84	0	3	1	1	0	0
Lamentations	31	14	0	0	0	2	0
Ecclesiastes	0	0	40	0	0	0	0
Song	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	811	60	293	43	95	23	33
TOTALS							
Pentateuch	1743	14	278	1	15	1	3
Historical Books ..	2123	8	439	2	5	0	2
Prophets	1762	44	153	5	30	1	3
Poetical Books	811	60	293	43	95	23	33
	6439 ²	126	1163	51	145	25	41

¹ In A and D enumerations are given, also for the alleged divisions of the Hexateuch into J, E, D, H and P: as also for the five books of the Psalter.

² *Jah* occurs twice in the Hexateuch (J E), forty times in the Psalms (once in Book II, twice in Book III, seven times in Book IV, thirty times in Book V). Cf. also Song viii. 6 (Cheyne, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 298).

B. COMPOSITE NAMES FOR GOD

	Jeho- vah	Ado- nay	Elo- him	Eloah	El	Sabaoth	
Genesis	19	2	16	0	18	0	0
Exodus	1	0	18	0	4	0	0
Leviticus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Numbers	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Deuteronomy	0	2	6	1	10	0	0
Joshua	0	1	4	0	2	0	0
Judges	0	2	7	0	0	0	0
Ruth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 Samuel	0	0	6	0	1	5	5
2 Samuel	2	6	4	0	1	6	5
1 Kings	0	2	3	0	0	3	1
2 Kings	3	0	3	0	1	2	2
1 Chronicles	4	0	7	0	0	3	3
2 Chronicles	5	0	10	0	0	0	0
Ezra	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Nehemiah	2	0	3	1	3	0	0
Psalms	1	8	25	1	22	16	7
Job	0	0	5	2	0	0	0
Isa. I-XXXIX	0	11	5	0	4	56	41
Isa. XL-LXVI	0	4	10	0	2	6	4
Jeremiah	1	14	4	0	1	80	34
Lamentations	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Ezekiel	0	217	6	0	4	0	0
Daniel	0	0	1	1	2	0	0
Hosea	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Joel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Amos	0	19	4	0	0	9	0
Jonah	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
Obadiah	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Micah	1	1	3	0	0	1	1
Nahum	0	0	1	0	0	2	2
Habakkuk	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
Zephaniah	0	1	2	0	0	2	1
Haggai	0	0	0	0	0	14	12
Zechariah	0	1	0	0	0	53	50
Malachi	0	0	1	0	1	24	24
Ecclesiastes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Song	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Esther	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Proverbs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	40 ³	293	160	6	79	284 ⁴	193 ⁵

³ *Jah* occurs in combinations twice in the Psalms and three times in Isaiah, cf. p. 466.

⁴ This column includes all titles in which *Sabaoth* (hosts) occurs.

⁵ This column gives only the occurrences of the title, Jehovah of Sabaoth.

		Jeho- vah	Ado- nay	Elo- him	Eloah	El	Sabaoth
HEXATEUCH							
P	0	0	2	0	6	0
JE	20	2	35	0	12	0
D	0	3	5	1	12	0
		20	5	42	1	30 ⁶	0
PSALMS							
Book	I.	0	0	6	0	1	1
	II.	0	4	9	0	7	3
	III.	1	1	7	0	8	3
	IV.	0	0	1	0	4	0
	V.	0	3	2	1	2	0
		1	8	25	1	22	7

I. COMPOUNDS WITH JEHOVAH

1. *Jehovah, the God who chose Abraham*, Neh. ix. 7.
2. *Jehovah, God of my master Abraham*, Gen. xxiv. 12, 27, 42, 48.
3. *Jehovah, God of Abraham thy father and the God of Isaac*, Gen. xxviii. 13.
4. *Jehovah, God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel*, 2 Chr. xxx. 6.
5. *Jehovah, God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel my father*, 1 Chr. xxix. 18.
6. *Jehovah, God of your father*, Deut. i. 11, 41, vi. 3, xii. 1, xxvi. 7, xxvii. 3, xxix. 24, Josh. xviii. 3, Jud. ii. 12.
7. *Jehovah, God of their (your) fathers*, 1 Chr. xxix. 20, 2 Chr. vii. 22, xi. 16, xiii. 12, 18, xiv. 3, xv. 12, xix. 4, xx. 6, xxi. 10, xxiv. 18, xxviii. 6, 9, 25, xxx. 7, 19, 22, xxxiv. 32, xxxvi. 15.
8. *Jehovah, God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob*, Ex. iii. 15, 16, iv. 5.
9. *Jehovah, the great God*, Neh. viii. 6.
10. *Jehovah, the God of the spirits of all flesh*, Num. xxvii. 16.
11. *Jehovah, God of Israel*, Josh. vii. 13, 19, 20, viii. 30, ix. 18, 19, x. 40, 42, xiii. 14, 33, xiv. 14, xxii. 24, xxiv. 2, 23, Jud. iv. 6, v. 3, v. 5, vi. 8, xi. 21, 23, xxi. 3, Ru. ii. 12, 1 Sam. ii. 30, v. 7, 8ter, 10, 11, vi. 3, x. 18, xiv. 14, xx. 12, xxiii. 10, 11, xxv. 32, 34, 2 Sam. xii. 7, 1 Ki. i. 30, 48, viii. 15, 17, 20, 23, 25, 26, xi. 9, 31, xiv. 7, 13, xv. 30, xvi. 13, 26, 33, xvii. 1, 14, xxii. 54, 2 Ki. ix. 6, x. 31, xiv. 25, xviii. 5, xix. 15, 20, xxi. 2, xxii. 15, 18, 1 Chr. xv. 12, 14, xvi. 4, 36, xxiii. 25, xxiv. 19, xxviii. 4, 2 Chr. ii. 11, vi. 4, 7, 10, 14, 16, 17, xi. 16, xiii. 5, xv. 4, xv. 13, xx. 19, xxix. 10, xxx. 1, 5, xxxii. 17, xxxiii. 16, 18, xxxiv. 23, 26, xxxvi. 13, Ezra i. 3, iv. 1, 3, vi. 21, vii. 6, ix. 15, Ps. xli. 14, cvi. 48, Isa. xvii. 6, xxi. 17, xxiv. 15, xxxvii. 21, Jer. 15 times, Mal. ii. 16.
12. *Jehovah, God of my lord the king*, 1 Kings i. 36.
13. *Jehovah, God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel*, 1 Kings xviii. 36.

⁶ The four occurrences in Gen. xiv. make up the total of 34 for the Hexateuch enumerated above.

14. *Jehovah, God of Elijah*, 2 Kings ii. 14.
15. *Jehovah, God of David thy father*, 2 Kings xx. 5, 2 Chr. xxi. 12, xxxiv. 3.
16. *Jehovah, God the God of Israel*, Ps. lxxii. 18.
17. *Jehovah, God of heaven*, Gen. xxiv. 7, Jonah i. 9, 2 Chr. xxxvi. 23, Ezra i. 2.
18. *Jehovah, God (אֱלֹהִי) of heaven, the great and terrible God (אֵל),* Neh. i. 5.
19. *Jehovah, God (אֵל) Most High, possessor of heaven and earth*, Gen. xiv. 22.
20. *Jehovah, God of heaven and God of earth*, Gen. xxiv. 3.
21. *Jehovah, God*, Gen. ii. 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, iii. 1, 8, 9, 13, 14, 21, 22, 23, Ex. ix. 30, 2 Sam. vii. 22, 25, 2 Ki. xix. 19, 1 Chr. xvii. 16, 17, xxviii. 20, xxix. 1, 2 Chr. i. 9, vi. 41bis, 42, xxvi. 18, Jon. iv. 6, Ps. lxxxiv. 12.
22. *Jehovah, Lord (אֲדֹנָי)*, Hab. iii. 19, Ps. lxviii. 21, cxi. 8, cxli. 8.
23. *Jehovah of hosts*, 1 Sam. i. 3, 11, iv. 4, xv. 2, 2 Sam. vi. 2, 18, vii. 8, 1 Ki. xviii. 15, 2 Ki. iii. 14, 19, 31, 1 Chr. xi. 9, xvii. 7, 24, Ps. xxiv. 10, xlv. 8, 12, lxxxiv. 2, 4, 13, Isa. i. 9, ii. 12, iii. 1, v. 7, 9, 16, 24, vi. 3, viii. 13, 18, ix. 6, 12, x. 26, 33, xiii. 4, 13, xiv. 22, 23, 24, 27, xvii. 3, xviii. 7bis, xix. 12, 16, 17, 18, 20, 25, xxii. 14, 25, xxiii. 9, xxiv. 23, xxv. 6, xxviii. 5, 29, xxix. 6, xxxi. 4, 5, xxxvii. 32, xxxix. 5, xlv. 13, xlviii. 2, li. 15, liv. 5, Jer. vi. 6, viii. 3, ix. 16, x. 16, xi. 17, 20, 22, xix. 11, xx. 12, xxiii. 15, 16, xxv. 8, 28, 29, 32, xxvi. 18, xxvii. 18, 19, xxix. 17, xxx. 8, xxxi. 35, xxxiii. 11, 12, xlv. 18, xlviii. 15, xlix. 7, 26, 35, l. 33, 34, li. 5, 19, 57, Mic. iv. 4, Nah. ii. 14, iii. 5, Hab. ii. 13, Zeph. ii. 10, Hag. i. 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, ii. 4, 8, 9bis, 11, 23bis, Zech. i. 3ter, 4, 6, 12, 14, 16, 17, ii. 12, 13, 15, iii. 7, 9, 10, iv. 6, 9, v. 4, vi. 12, 15, vii. 3, 4, 9, 12bis, 13, viii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6bis, 7, 9bis, 11, 14bis, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, ix. 15, x. 3, xiii. 2, 7, xiv. 21bis, Mal. i. 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, ii. 2, 4, 7, 8, 12, 16, iii. 1, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 19, 21.
24. *Jehovah of hosts, (their, your) God*, Hag. i. 14, Zech. xii. 5.
25. *Jehovah of hosts, the God of Israel*, 2 Sam. vii. 27, 1 Chr. xxii. 6, Jer. (31 times), Isa. xxi. 10, Zeph. ii. 9.
26. *Jehovah of hosts, God over Israel*, 2 Sam. vii. 26.
27. *Jehovah, God of hosts*, 2 Sam. v. 10, 1 Ki. xix. 10, 14, Ho. xii. 6, Amos iv. 13, v. 14, 15, 27, vi. 8, 14, Jer. v. 14, xv. 16, Ps. lxix. 7, lxxx. 5, 20, lxxxiv. 9, lxxxix. 9.
28. *Jehovah of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel*, 1 Sam. xvii. 45.
29. *Jehovah of hosts, the Holy One of Israel*, Isa. xlvii. 4.
30. *Jehovah, God of hosts, the Lord*, Am. v. 16.
31. *Jehovah, God of hosts, the God of Israel*, Ps. lix. 6, Jer. xxxv. 17, xlv. 7.
32. *Jehovah, the holy God*, 1 Sam. vi. 20, Isa. x. 20.

33. *Jehovah, thy God the Holy One of Israel, thy Savior*, Isa. xliii. 3.
34. *Jehovah, your redeemer, the Holy One of Israel*, Isa. xliii. 14, xlviii. 17.
35. *Jehovah, the Holy One of Israel and his Maker*, Isa. xlv. 11.
36. *Jehovah, the redeemer of Israel, his Holy One*, Isa. xlix. 7.
37. *Jehovah, your Holy One, the Creator of Israel, your king*, Isa. xliii. 15.
38. *Jehovah, King of Israel*, Isa. xlv. 6.
39. *Jehovah, God of eternity*, Gen. xxi. 33.
40. *Jehovah, God is truth, a living God and an everlasting king*, Jer. x. 10.

Ia. COMPOUNDS WITH JAH

1. *Jah, Elohim*, Ps. lxviii. 9.
2. *Jah, Adonay*, Ps. cxxx. 3 (?).
3. *Jah, Jehovah*, Isa. xii. 2, xxvi. 4.
4. *Jah, Jah*, Isa. xxxviii. 11.

II. COMPOUNDS WITH THE LORD (הַאֲדֹנָי) AND LORD (אֲדֹנִי)

1. *The Lord of lords*, Deut. x. 17, Ps. cxxxvi. 3.
2. *Lord of all the earth*, Jos. iii. 11, 13, Ps. xcvi. 5, Zach. iv. 14, vi. 5, Mic. iv. 13.
3. *The Lord Jehovah*, Ex. xxiii. 17.
4. *The Lord Jehovah, the God of Israel*, Ex. xxxiv. 23.
5. *The Lord, Jehovah of hosts*, Isa. iii. 1, x. 33, xix. 4, Ps. lxix. 7.
6. *The Lord, Jehovah, God of hosts*, Amos iii. 13.
7. *The Lord, Jehovah of hosts, the mighty One (אֲבִיר) of Israel*, Isa. i. 24.
8. *Lord, Jehovah*, 293 times (see Summary, p. 463).
9. *The great and terrible Lord*, Neh. iv. 8.
10. *Lord, the God (הָאֱלֹהִים)*, Dan. ix. 3.
11. *The Lord, the great and terrible God (הָאֵל)*, Dan. ix. 4.
12. *Lord, Jehovah, the holy One of Israel*, Isa. xxx. 15.

Ia. COMPOUNDS WITH LORD (מֶלֶךְ)

1. *Lord of Kings*, Dan. ii. 47.
2. *Lord of heaven*, Dan. v. 23.

III. COMPOUNDS WITH GOD (ELOHIM)

1. *God of Shem*, Gen. ix. 26.
2. *God of Abraham*, Gen. xxvi. 24, xxxi. 13, Ps. xlvii. 10.
3. *God of Abraham and God of Nahor*, Gen. xxxi. 53.
4. *God of Israel*, Ex. xxiv. 10, Num. xvi. 9, Josh. xxii. 16, 1 Sam. i. 17, vi. 3, 5, 2 Sam. xxiii. 3, 1 Chr. iv. 10, v. 26, 2 Chr. xxix. 7, Ezra iii. 2, viii. 35, ix. 4, Isa. xxix. 23, xlv. 3, xlviii. 2, lii. 12, Ezek. viii. 4, ix. 3, x. 19, 20, xi. 22, xliii. 2, xlv. 2, Ps. lix. 6, lxviii. 9, lxi. 7.
5. *God of Jacob*, 2 Sam. xxiii. 1, Isa. ii. 3, Mic. iv. 2, Ps. xx. 2, xlviii. 8, 12, lxxv. 10, lxxvi. 7, lxxx. 2, 5, lxxxiv. 9, xciv. 7.

6. *God of David*, Isa. xxxviii. 5.
7. *God of (my, thy, etc.) father (or fathers)*, Gen. xxxi. 5, 29, xliii. 23, i. 17, Ex. iii. 13, vi. 3, xi. 2, xviii. 4, i Chr. v. 25, xii. 17, xxviii. 9, 2 Chr. xvii. 4, xx. 23, xxxiii. 12, Dan. xi. 37.
8. *Elohim, the God of your fathers*, 2 Chr. xxxiv. 32.
9. *Elohim, the God of Israel*, Ezra vi. 22.
10. *God of my father, the God of Abraham, and the Fear (פחד) of Isaac*, Gen. xxxi. 42.
11. *God of my father Abraham*, Gen. xxxii. 10.
12. *God of my father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob*, Ex. iii. 6.
13. *God of Israel my father*, i Chr. xxix. 10.
14. *God of the Hebrews*, Ex. v. 3.
15. *God of the mountains*, i Kings xx. 23, 28.
16. *God of the valleys*, i Kings xx. 28.
17. *God of Hezekiah*, 2 Chr. xxxii. 17.
18. *God of Jerusalem*, 2 Chr. xxxii. 19.
19. *God of heaven*, Neh. i. 4, ii. 4, 20.
20. *God of earth*, Zeph. ii. 11.
21. *God Jehovah, that dwelt between the Cherubim*, i Chr. xiii. 6.
22. *God of all the earth*, Isa. v. 45.
23. *God at hand*, Jer. xxiii. 23.
24. *God afar off*, Jer. xxiii. 23.
25. *God of the spirits of all flesh*, Num. xvi. 22.
26. *God of my rock*, 2 Sam. xxii. 3.
27. *God of (my, thy, etc.) salvation (ישועה)* 2 Sam. xxii. 47, Hab. v. 18, i Chr. xvi. 5, Mic. vii. 7, Isa. xvii. 10, Ps. xviii. 47, xxiv. 5, xxv. 5, xxvii. 9, lxxv. 6, lxxix. 9, lxxxv. 5.
28. *God of salvation, (תשועה)* Ps. li. 16.
29. *God of judgment*, Isa. xxxvi. 1, Mal. ii. 17.
30. *God of מרום*, Mic. vi. 6.
31. *God of eternity (קרם)* Deut. xxxiii. 27.
32. *God of eternity (עולם)*, *Jehovah, the Creator of the ends of the earth*, Isa. xl. 28.
33. *God of truth, (אמת)* Isa. lxxv. 16bis, 2 Chr. xv. 3 (אמת), Jer. x. 10.
34. *God of righteousness*, Ps. iv. 2.
35. *God of strength*, Ps. xliii. 2.
36. *God of mercy (חסד)*, Ps. lix. 11, 18.
37. *God of praise*, Ps. cix. 1.
38. *God of hosts, the God of Israel*, Jer. xxxv. 17, xxxviii. 17, xliv. 7.

IV. COMPOUNDS WITH GOD (ELOAH)

1. *God of מליחות* Neh. ix. 17.
2. *God, his (my) maker*, Deut. xxxii. 15, Job. xxxv. 10.
3. *God מעונך*, Job xi. 6.
4. *God of Jacob*, Ps. cxiv. 7.

5. *God* נכר, Dan. xi. 39.
6. *God* מעזים, Dan. xi. 3.

IVa. COMPOUNDS WITH GOD (אֱלֹהִים)

Jer. x. 11. Ezra, 15 times. Daniel, 19 times.

V. COMPOUNDS WITH (EL).

1. *God of thy father*, Gen. xlix. 25.
2. *The God, the God* (אֱלֹהִי) *of thy father*, Gen. xlv. 3.
3. *God, the God of Israel*, Gen. xxxiii. 20.
4. *God, God* (אֱלֹהִים), *Jehovah*, Josh. xxii. 22bis, Ps. 1, 1.
5. *God, the God* (אֱלֹהִי) *of Israel*, Gen. xxiii. 20.
6. *God, the God* (אֱלֹהִי) *of the spirit of all flesh*, Num. xvi. 22.
7. *God of gods*, Ex. xv. 11.
8. *God of Jacob*, Ps. cxlvi. 5.
9. *God of Jeshurun*, Deut. xxxiii. 26.
10. *God of Israel*, Ps. lxviii. 36.
11. *God of nations*, Ezek. xxxi. 11.
12. *God of the heavens*, Ps. cxxxvi. 26.
13. *God of the earth*, 2 Kings. xxiv. 15, Ezek. xvii. 13.
14. *God in heaven and in earth*, Deut. iii. 24, Lam. iii. 41.
15. *God of Bethel*, Gen. xxxiii. 7.
16. *The God of Bethel*, Gen. xxxi. 13.
17. *God, Most High* (גִּבּוֹר) Gen. xiv. 18, 20, Ps. lxviii. 35.
18. *God, Most High, possessor of heaven and earth*, Gen. xiv. 19.
19. *God, Almighty* (שָׂרִי) Gen. xvii. 1, xxviii. 3, xxxv. 11, xliii. 14, xlvi. 3, Ex. vi. 3, Ezek. x. 5.
20. *Mighty God*, Isa. ix. 5, x. 21.
21. *The great, the mighty, and the terrible, God*, Deut. x. 17.
22. *The great and terrible God, keeping the covenant and mercy*, Neh. i. 5.
23. *The great, the mighty, and the terrible, God, keeping the covenant and the mercy*, Neh. ix. 32.
24. *The great, the mighty, God, Jehovah of hosts*, Jer. xxii. 18.
25. *Great and terrible God*, Deut. vii. 21.
26. *Great God*, Ps. lxxvii. 14, xcv. 3.
27. *Merciful God*, Deut. iv. 31.
28. *Righteous God*, Isa. xlv. 21.
29. *Jealous God*, Ex. xx. 5, xxxiv. 14, Deut. iv. 24, v. 9, vi. 15, Josh. xxiv. 19.
30. *God, jealous and vengeful*, Nah. i. 2.
31. *Merciful and gracious God*, Ex. xxxiv. 6, Ps. lxxxvi. 15.
32. *Gracious and merciful God*, Neh. ix. 31.
33. *The holy God*, Isa. v. 16.
34. *Other God*, Ex. xxxiv. 14.
35. *Living God*, Josh. iii. 10, Hos. ii. 1, Ps. xlii. 3, lxxxiv. 3.
36. *The trustworthy, covenant-keeping, God*, Deut. vii. 9.

37. *The God of truth* (אמת), Ps. xxxi. 6.
38. *The God of truth* (אמונה), Deut. xxxii. 4.
39. *The God of knowledge*, 1 Sam. ii. 3.
40. *The God of eternity* (עולם), Gen. xxi. 33.
41. *The God of righteousness*, Isa. lxi. 3.
42. *God of recompenses*, Jer. li. 56.
43. *God of salvation* (ישועה), Isa. xii. 2.
44. *God of salvation* (למושעות), Ps. lxviii. 21.
45. *Savior-God*, Ps. cvi. 21.
46. *God of vengeance*, Ps. xciv. 1.
47. *God, that avengeth me*, Ps. xviii. 48, 2 Sam. xxii. 48.
48. *God, who appeared to me*, Gen. xxxv. 1.
49. *God, whose way is perfect*, Ps. xviii. 31, 2 Sam. xxii. 31.
50. *God, who answered me*, Gen. xxxv. 3.
51. *God, doing wonders*, Ps. lxxvii. 15.
52. *God, who formed thee*, Deut. xxxii. 18.

VI. COMPOUNDS WITH SABAOth

See especially under *Jehovah of Hosts* (I.24ff.); also under II. 6, 7, III. 38, V. 24.

C. OTHER WORDS SOMETIMES USED FOR, OR WITH, GOD, OR JEHOVAH.

I. SPIRIT

1. *Spirit* (רוח) of God, Gen. i. 2, xli. 38, Ex. xxxi. 3, xxxv. 31, Num. xxiv. 2, 1 Sam. x. 10, xi. 6, xvi. 15, 16, 23, xviii. 10, xix. 20, 2 Chr. xv. 1, xviii. 23, xx. 14.
2. *Spirit of Jehovah*, Jud. iii. 10, vi. 34, xi. 29, xiii. 25, xiv. 6, 19, xv. 14, 1 Sam. x. 6, xvi. 13, 14, xix. 9, 2 Sam. xxiii. 2, 1 Ki. xviii. 20, xxii. 24, Isa. xi. 2, xl. 7, 13, lix. 19, lxiii. 14, Ezek. xi. 5, xxxvii. 1, Hosea xiii. 15, Mi. ii. 7, iii. 8.
3. *Spirit of Lord, Jehovah*, Isa. lxi. 1.
4. *Holy Spirit*, Isa. lxiii. 10, 11.

II. SOUL

1. *Soul* (נפש), Lev. xxvi. 11, 30, Isa. i. 14, Jer. v. 9, 29, ix. 9, xii. 7, xv. 1, Zech. xi. 8.

III. HOLY ONE

1. *The Holy One*, Job. vi. 10, Isa. x. 17, Hab. i. 12, iii. 3, Prov. xxx. 4 (קרשם).
2. *The Holy One of Israel*, 2 Kings xix. 22, Isa. i. 4, v. 19, 24, xii. 6, xvii. 7, xxix. 19, xxx. 11, 12, xxxi. 1, xxxvii. 23, xli. 16, 20, xlix. 7, liv. 15, lv. 5, lx. 9, 14, Ps. lxxi. 22, lxxviii. 41, lxxxix. 19.
3. *The Holy One of Jacob*, Isa. xxix. 23.
4. *The Holy God* (אל), Isa. v. 26.
5. *Jehovah, the Holy God*, 1 Sam. vi. 20.
6. *Lord, Jehovah, the Holy One of Israel*, Isa. xxx. 15.

7. *Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel*, Isa. xli. 4.

See also under "Name" (vi. 4, 15.)

IV. MIGHTY ONE

1. *The mighty One of Jacob*, Gen. xlix. 24, Ps. cxxxii. 2, 5.
2. *The mighty One of Israel*, Isa. i. 24.
3. *Thy Redeemer, the mighty One of Israel*, Isa. xlix. 26, lx. 16.

V. FACE

1. *The face of Jehovah*, Ex. xxxiv. 24, 1 Sam. xiii. 12, xxvi. 20, 2 Sam. xxi. 1, 1 Ki. xiii. 6, 2 Ki. xiii. 4, 2 Chr. xxxiii. 12, Job i. 12, ii. 7, Ps. xxxiv. 17, Jer. xxvi. 19, Dan. ix. 13, Zech. vii. 2, viii. 21, 22.
2. *The face of God*, Ps. xlii. 3 (אלהים), Mal. i. 9 (אל).
3. *The face of the Most High*, Lam. iii. 35.
4. *My (thy) face*, Ex. xx. 3, xxiii. 15, xxxiii. 14, 15, 20, 23, xxxiv. 20, Lev. xvii. 10, xx. 3, 5, 6, xxvi. 17, Deut. v. 7, xxxi. 17, 18, xxxii. 20, 2 Chr. vii. 14, 20, Ps. iv. 7, xiii. 2, xvi. 11, xxvii. 8, Isa. i. 12, l. 6, 7, liv. 8, lxxv. 3, Jer. vii. 15, xv. 1, xxi. 10, xxiii. 39, xxxii. 31, xxxiii. 5, xliv. 11, Ezek. vii. 22, xiv. 8, xv. 7bis, xxxix. 23, 24, 29, Hos. v. 15, vii. 2.

VI. NAME

1. *Name of Jehovah*, Gen. xvi. 13, Deut. xxviii. 10, xxxii. 3, Job i. 21, Joel ii. 26, Mi. v. 3, Pro. xviii. 10, Isa. xxx. 27, lvi. 6, lix. 19, Ps. cii. 16, 22, cxiii. 1, 2, 3, cxxxv. 1, cxlviii. 5, 13.
2. *Name of Jehovah, thy God*, Ex. xx. 7, Lev. xxiv. 16, Deut. v. 11.
3. *Name of thy (your, etc.) God*, Lev. xviii. 21, xix. 12, xxi. 6, Ps. xlv. 11, Pro. xxx. 9.
4. *Holy Name*, Lev. xx. 3, xxii. 2, 32, Ps. ciii. 1, cxlv. 21, Ezek. xx. 39, xxxvi. 20, 21, xxxix. 7bis, xliii. 8, Amos ii. 7.
5. *The name, my name, etc.*, Gen. xxxii. 30, Lev. xxiv. 11, 16, Jud. xiii. 18, 2 Sam. vii. 13, 1 Kings v. 19, viii. 18, 19, ix. 7, 1 Chr. xxii. 8, 10, xxviii. 3, 2 Chr. vi. 8, 9, vii. 20, Mal. i. 11, ii. 2.
6. *The name, the name of Jehovah*, 1 Sa. vi. 2.
7. *The glorious name*, Neh. ix. 5, Ps. lxxii. 19, Deut. xxviii. 58.
8. *The name of Jehovah, Most High*, Ps. vii. 18.
9. *The name of Jehovah of hosts*, Isa. xviii. 7.
10. *The name of Jehovah, God of Israel*, Isa. xxiv. 15.
11. *The name of the God of Jacob*, Ps. xx. 2. (Cf. *The name of other gods*, Ex. xxiii. 13.
12. *In the name of Jehovah*, Gen. iv. 26, xii. 8, xiii. 4, xxi. 23, xxvi. 25, Ex. xxiii. 19, xxxiv. 5, Deut. xviii. 5, 22, xxi. 5, 1 Sam. xvii. 45, xx. 42, 2 Sam. vi. 18, 1 Ki. xviii. 24, 32, xxii. 16, 2 Ki. ii. 24, 1 Chr. xvi. 2, xxi. 19, 2 Chr. xviii. 15, Ps. cxvi. 4, 13, 17, cxviii. 10, 11, 12, 26, cxxiv. 8, cxxix. 8, Isa. xlviii. 1, l. 10, Jer. xi. 21, xxvi. 9, 20, xlv. 16, Joel iii. 5, Am. vi. 10, Mi. iv. 5, Zeph. iii. 9, 12, Zech. xiii. 4.
13. *In the name of Jehovah, (his) God*, Deut. xviii. 7, Jer. xxvi. 16, Josh. xxiii. 7, Ex. vi. 3 (?), 2 Kings v. 11, Ps. xx. 8.
14. *In the name of (your) God*, 1 Ki. xviii. 24, 25, Mi. iv. 5, Ps. xx.

6. (Cf. *In the name of other gods*, Deut. xviii. 20. *In the name of Baal*, 1 Ki. xviii. 26.)

15. *In his holy name*, 1 Chr. xvi. 10, Ps. xxxiii. 21, cv. 3.

16. *In the name of Jehovah, God of Israel*, 2 Chr. xxxiii. 18.

17. *In (my) name Jehovah liveth*, Jer. xii. 16.

18. *To the name of Jehovah*, 1 Ki. iii. 2, v. 17, 19, x. 1, 1 Chr. xxii. 7, 19, 2 Chr. i. 18, Ps. cxxii. 4, Jer. iii. 17.

19. *To the name of Jehovah, God of Israel*, 1 Ki. viii. 17, 20, 2 Chr. vi. 7, 10.

20. *To the name of Jehovah, (my) God*, 2 Chr. ii. 3, Isa. lx. 9.

21. *To (thy) holy name*, 1 Chr. xvi. 35, xxix. 16, Ps. xvi. 47, Ezek. xxxvi. 22, xxxix. 25.

22. *In (my, thy) name*, Ex. v. 23, Lev. xix. 12, Deut. xviii. 19, 20, Isa. xli. 25, xliii. 7, lxiv. 6, lxv. 1, Jer. xii. 16 (?), xiv. 14, xv. 23, 25, xxvii. 15, xxix. 9, 21, 23, x. 25, Zech. v. 4, xiii. 9, Dan. ix. 6, Ps. lxxxix. 25, lxxx. 19, xlvi. 11, 2 Chr. xiv. 10.

23. *By my great name*, Jer. xlv. 26.

24. *To (my, thy) name*, Gen. xxxii. 20, Jud. xiii. 18, 2 Sam. vii. 13, xxii. 50, 1 Ki. v. 19, viii. 18, 19, 44, 48, ix. 7, 1 Chr. xxii. 8, 10, xxviii. 3, 2 Chr. vi. 8, 9, 34, 38, vii. 20, ix. 7, xx. 8, Mal. i. 11, ii. 2, Ps. xviii. 50, lxxxvi. 9, cxv. 1, cxi. 14.

25. *To thy great name*, Josh. vii. 9.

26. *To thy name, Most High*, Ps. xcii. 2.

27. *As thy name, O God*, Ps. xlviii. 11.

VII. ANGEL

1. *Angel of Jehovah*, Gen. xvi. 7, 9, 10, 11, xxii. 11, 15, Ex. iii. 2, Num. xxii. 22, 23, 24, 26, 31, 32, 34, 35, xxv. 27, Jud. ii. 1, 4, v. 23, vi. 11, 12, 20, 21bis, 22bis, xiii. 3, 13, 15, 16bis, 17, 18, 20, 21, 1 Ki. xix. 7, 2 Ki. i. 15, xix. 35, 1 Chr. xxi. 16, xxi. 30, Ps. liv. 8, Isa. xxxvii. 36, Hag. i. 13, Zach. i. 11, 12, iii. 1, 6, xii. 8.

2. *Angel of Jehovah of hosts*, Mal. ii. 7.

3. *My (his) angel*, Gen. xiv. 7, 40, Ex. xxiii. 23, 32, 34, Mal. iii. 1.

VIII. HEAVEN⁷

1. *Heaven* (used as title of God), Dan. iv. 31(?), Syb. Or. 247. 1 Macc. iii. 18, 19, iv. 24(?), xiii. 3, 2 Macc. vii. 11, ix. 20, Sus. 9, Pirke Ab. i. 3, iv. 14bis, v. 20ter, Matt. xxi. 25, Mk. viii. 11, xi. 30, Lk. xi. 16, xv. 18, 21, xx. 4, 5, Jn. iii. 27, vi. 31, 32bis, Acts ix. 3, Rom. i. 18, 2 Thess. i. 7.

2. *God of Heaven*, Ps. cxxxvi. 26 (𐤒𐤍), Neh. i. 4, ii. 4, 20, Ezra v. 11, 12, vi. 9, 10, vii. 12, 21, 23bis, Dan. ii. 18, 19, 37, 44, Ahikar (Arabic recension), vi. 26. Tobit vii. 12 (LXX.), viii. 15 (𐤍), x. 11 (B). Book of Noah cvi. 5, Sib. Or. 174, 286, Jub. xii. 4, xx. 7, xxii. 19, Jud. v. 8, xi. 17, XII. Pat. Reuben 1, 3 Macc. vii. 6, Assump. Mos. ii. 4, Rev. xi. 13, xvi. 11.

⁷ In the case of this title the occurrences in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha and in the New Testament are included for convenience.

3. *Heavenly God*, Sib Or. 19, 3, Bar. xi. 9.
4. *Heavenly Sovereign*, 2 Macc. xv. 23.
5. *God of heaven and earth*, XII Pat. Iss. 1.
6. *Jehovah, God Most High, possessor of heaven and earth*, Gen. xiv. 22.
7. *Lord of heaven*, Dan. v. 23, Book of Noah cvi. 2, 1 En. xiii. 4, Assump. Mos. iv. 4.
8. *Lord of heaven and earth*, Matt. xi. 25, Acts xvii. 18.
9. *The Lord, which made heaven and earth*, 1 Esd. vi. 13.
10. *Lord, King of heaven*, 3 Macc. ii. 2.
11. *Lord, God of heaven*, Judith vii. 19.
12. *Lord, God of heaven and earth*, XII Pat. Benj. 1, Gen. xxiv. 3, (Jehovah for Lord).
13. *Jehovah, the God of the heavens*, Gen. xxiv. 7, Jon. i. 9, (*which hath made the sea and the dry land*) 2 Chr. xxxvi. 23, Ezra i. 2, Neh. i. 5.
14. *King of heaven*, Dan. iv. 34, Tob. xiii. 7, 11, 16, 1 Esd. iv. 46, 58, XII Pat. Benj. 1.
15. *Heavenly One*, Assump. Mos. x. 3.
16. *Creator of Heaven and earth*, Ahikar (Arabic recension) i. 5, Syb. Or. 786.
17. *Name of heaven*, Pirke Aboth i. 11, ii. 2, 16, iv. 5.
18. *Father, who is in heaven*, Pirke Aboth v. 23.
19. *Kingdom of heaven*, Matt. *passim*.

D. REMARKS AND CONCLUSIONS

In the lists which have been published above and in the number of the Review for October and January last have been assembled and enumerated all the designations of the Deity occurring in Jewish and Christian literature (excepting the New Testament, Philo, and Josephus) down to the year 135 A.D. and also the words for Lord and God in the Koran, making altogether about 15,000 instances. We shall give at this time but a few of the many uses which may be made of these lists in determining the age and authorship, the genuineness and composition of the documents in which the designations occur. Other discussions are left for a future occasion.

I. ELOHIM IN THE PSALMS

Dr. Driver says that "the exceptional preponderance of Elohim over Jehovah in Book II [of the Psalter] (Ps. xlii.-lxxii.) and in Ps. lxxiii.-lxxxiii., cannot be attributed to a

preference of the authors of these Psalms for the former name; not only is such a supposition improbable in itself, but it is precluded by the occurrence of the *same two* Psalms, in the double recension just spoken of, once with *Jehovah* (Ps. xiv., xl. 13-17) and once with *Elohim* (Ps. liii., lxx.): it must be due to the fact that Book II and Ps. lxxiii. to lxxxiii. have passed through the hands of a compiler who *changed* 'Jehovah' of the original author to 'Elohim.' The reason of this change probably is that at the time when this compiler lived there was a current preference for the latter name (compare the exclusive use of the same name in Ecclesiastes and the preference shown for it by the Chronicler)."⁸

In view of the fact that the author of Ecclesiastes uses Elohim 40 times and Jehovah never, that the author of Gen. i-ii. 3 uses Elohim 20 times and Jehovah never; that the author of the Letter of Aristaeus uses God 105 times and Lord but once; that 4 Maccabees uses God 40 times and Lord never; that the third Book of the Sibylline Oracles uses God 41 times and Lord never; and that Tobit, Esdras, Judith, 1, 2 and 3 Maccabees, and 4 Enoch, never use Jehovah, and especially in view of the fact that E (according to the critics) always uses Elohim and P always up to Ex. vi. 3, it is strange that a critic should say that a preference for Elohim over Jehovah cannot be attributed to the author of the Elohistie psalms or that such a preference "is improbable in itself." Anyone who claims that the E document of the Hexateuch used only Elohim and the J document only Jehovah must admit that there may have been psalmists living in the same time as the author of J and E who used only Elohim or Jehovah.

As far as Psalms xiv. and liii. are concerned there is more evidence in the Mss. and versions that Elohim was changed by scribes to Jehovah than contrariwise.⁹ That late writers

⁸ LOT, p. 371 f.

⁹ Thus, for the four Jehovahs in Ps. xiv. two Mss. give Elohim in vs. 4 and one in vs. 7, whereas for the Elohim in Ps. liii. thirteen Mss. give Jehovah in vs. 5, one in vs. 6a and one in 6b, and eight

may have preferred Lord to God is abundantly shown by the following table :

	Esd.	Sira (LXX)	Azariah	5 Enoch	Odes of Sol	Baruch (LXX)
<i>Lord</i>	95	194	43	37	93	32
<i>God</i>	16	11	2	1	11	3

That other late writers preferred God to Lord we have shown above. That others may have preferred to use both is clear from the following table :

		xii	Susannah	Psalms		Assump.	
	Jub.	Patr.	(LXX) (Theod.)	of Sol.	1 Bar.	of Moses	
<i>Lord</i>	184	229	98	83	105	25	19
<i>God</i>	73	124	77	99	112	29	15

That some writers used neither Elohim nor Jehovah is shown by Esther, the Song of Songs, Judith, 1, 2, 3 Mac-cabees and the Zadokite Fragments. Any "current preference" for either name from the earliest literary period of the critics own devising (850-700 B.C.) down to 135 A.D. is, therefore, ruled out of the evidence. *Individual* preferences there were, but *current* not. The Chronicler does not show such a preference as Dr. Driver claimed that he did. We shall discuss elsewhere in this article the passages in Chronicles which are parallel to Samuel-Kings. A comparison between Chronicles and Samuel-Kings in both the parallel and non-parallel passages gives the following results. In the parallel passages Elohim occurs in Chronicles 80 times and Jehovah 220, whereas in Samuel-Kings Elohim occurs 31 times and Jehovah 302 times; but in the non-parallel passages of Chronicles, Elohim occurs 6 times and Jehovah 327 times, whereas in Samuel-Kings, Elohim occurs 97 times and Jehovah 383 times. When we remember that nearly all (all but 4 or 6) of the changes from the Jehovah of Samuel-Kings are not into Elohim but into

Mss. in vs. 7. The Targum to xiv. gives "not merely for Jehovah but also for the Elohim of vs. 5 and in lxii. for the Elohim of vss. 3, 5, 6b. and 7. The Syriac always has Lord in xiv. and also in liii. 7. The LXX agrees with the Hebrew *textus receptus* except in liii. 7 where it has Lord for God. The Latin always has *Dominus* in xiv. and also in liii. 5, 6b. and 7.

Ha-Elohim the assumption of numerous, or consistent, preferential changes on the part of the compiler of Chronicles (or even of a copier) is rendered the more absurd.

In view, then, of all the above evidence it would seem best to postpone an attempt to account on subjective grounds for the alleged wholesale changes in Books II and III of the Psalter from Jehovah to Elohim until it shall be proven by sufficient objective evidence such as manuscripts and versions that such changes were made.

II. ELOHIM IN CHRONICLES

Dr. Driver says¹⁰ that "the compiler of Chronicles in the non-parallel parts evinces a preference for Elohim as over against Jehovah."¹¹ An enumeration of the times that each occurs shows that in the non-parallel parts of 1 Chronicles Jehovah is found 115 times to 34 times for Elohim and in 2 Chronicles, Jehovah 212 times to 35 for Elohim, or in both together Jehovah 327 times to 69 times for Elohim. That this shows no preference on the part of the Chronicler for the use of Elohim is manifest when we note that the proportions in the non-parallel parts of 2 Samuel are 87 to 17, of 1 Kings 148 to 40 and of 2 Kings 148 to 42; or in all three books together, of 383 to 99. That is the percentage of the occurrences of Jehovah in the non-parallel passages of 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings is 79.3 as against 82.6 in Chronicles and of Elohim 20.7 to 17.3.

In the passages of Chronicles that are parallel to passages in Samuel and Kings, there are only four cases where Elohim is used in Chronicles where Jehovah appears in Samuel-Kings, to wit: 1 Chr. xvii. 3=2 Sam. vii. 4, 2 Chr. i. 7=1 Ki. iii. 5, 2 Chr. xxxiii. 7=2 Ki. xxi. 7, and 2 Chr. xxxiv. 27=2 Ki. xxii. 19.¹² In fifteen other cases

¹⁰ LOT p. 21, Note.

¹¹ So also Cheyne (*Bampton Lectures* p. 298): "The compiler of Chronicles, though he frequently uses Jehovah, shows a tendency to prefer Elohim."

¹² In 1 Chr. xiv. 9, 13=2 Sa. v. 19, 23, Chronicles has כְּאֱלֹהִים for Jehovah. If the preposition is read as *bē* there would be two more cases of change to Elohim: if *ba*, as in Ps. lxxxvi. 8, there would be two more cases of change to Hā-Elohim.

Chronicles has "the God" (האלהים) for Jehovah¹³ and twice Chronicles has Jehovah where Samuel-Kings has "the God."¹⁴

Now, Jehovah is frequently said to be "*the* God," "the only God" as in Deut. iv. 35, 39, vii. 9, Jos. xxii. 34, 2 Sam. vii. 28, 1 Ki. viii. 60, xviii 21, 37, 39*bis*, 2 Ki. xix. 15, Isa. xxxvii. 16, xlv. 18, 1 Chr. xvii. 26. Except the last of these places, these instances are all in documents written before 550 B.C.; and the last is from the Chronicler himself. Are the critics going to maintain that there is no distinction between *Elohim* and *Hā-Elohim*? Should they not at least have informed their readers that in fifteen cases the Chronicler uses *Hā-Elohim* instead of the Jehovah of Samuel-Kings; whereas in only four cases has he *Elohim*? Jehovah is an *Elohim* and is frequently so called; but he alone is *the* *Elohim*, and the only *Elohim* is Jehovah.

That from their conclusions the critics can take no refuge in the Mss. and versions will appear from the following collation.¹⁵

For האלהים we find the following variations:

	Greek.	Syriac.	Latin.	Hebrew Mss.
1 Chr. xvii. 2	θεος	—	Deus.	Elohim, 1 Ms.
1 Chr. xiii. 8	ο θεος	כריא	"	Jehovah, 1 Ms.
xiii. 12a	" "	"	"	" 1 Ms.
12b	" "	"	"	No variants
14	" "	"	"	" "
xiv. 11	—	"	"	Elohim, 2 Ms.
14	ο θεος	—	"	No variants
15	" "	כריא	"	" "
16	" "	"	"	Elohim, 1 Ms.
xxi. 8	" "	"	"	No variants
15	" "	"	—	{ Elohim, 1 Ms. Jehovah, 1 Ms.
17a	" "	"	Deus.	No variants

¹³ To wit, 1 Chr. xiii. 8=2 Sam. vi. 5, 1 Chr. xiii. 12*bis*. 14=2 Sam. vi. 9*bis*, 10, 1 Chr. xiv. 11, 14, 15=2 Sam. v. 20, 24, 25, 1 Chr. xvii. 2=2 Sa. vii. 3, 1 Chr. xxi 8, 15, 17a=2 Sam. xxiv. 10a, 15, 17a, 2 Chr. x. 15=1 Ki. xii. 15, 2 Chr. xxii. 12=2 Ki. xi. 2, 2 Chr. xxiii. 9=2 Ki. xi. 10, 2 Chr. xxv. 24=2 Ki. xiv. 14.

¹⁴ In 1 Chr. xvii. 1=2 Sam. vii. 2, and 2 Chr. xi. 2=1 Ki. xii. 22.

¹⁵ The Hebrew collations are from Kennicott, the Greek from Swete, the others from Walton.

2 Chr. x.	15	ὁ θεος	סריא	<i>Deus.</i>	No variants
xxii.	12	" "	"	"	Jehovah, the God, 1 Ms.
xxiii.	9	" "	"	<i>Dominus</i>	No variants
xxv.	24	κύριος	"	<i>Deus</i>	Jehovah, 1 Ms.

For אלהים we find the following variations:

1 Chr. xvii.	3	κύριος	—	<i>Deus</i>	Hā-Elohim, 1 Ms.
2 Chr. i.	7	ὁ θεος	סריא	<i>Dominus</i>	Hā-Elohim, 1 Ms.
xxxiii.	7	" "	"	"	{ Hā-Elohim, 1 Ms. Omits entirely, 1 Ms.
xxxiv.	27	μου	"	"	{ Hā-Elohim, 3 Ms. Omits entirely, 1 Ms.

III. "THE GOD OF THE PSALTER"

A large part of Prof. Cheyne's Bampton Lectures for 1889 on the *Origin and Growth of the Psalter*, is taken up with a discussion of the names and titles of the deity. Lecture six is on the subject: *Who is the God of the Psalter?* He states it as his opinion that the "Elohistic phraseology" (*sic!*) of the psalms of Books II and III is often due to the editors of these books,¹⁶ and that it is our duty to enter into the feelings of those who in certain passages changed 'Jahweh' (Jehovah) into 'Elohim' (God) and of those who afterwards by degrees substituted 'Adonai' (the Lord) for 'Yahweh.'¹⁷ He calls attention to "the fact that certain books (Job, Koheleth, Esther, Daniel) almost or altogether avoid the word Jehovah,"¹⁸ and speaks of the frequent change of Jahveh into Elohim in the Levitical psalms.

Since Profs. Cheyne, Driver, *et al*, claim that this use of Elohim instead of Jehovah is a proof of the lateness of the psalms in which Elohim occurs, what becomes of their theory that E (the Elohistic document) is the earliest part of the Hexateuch and probably of the whole Old Testament? Again, if the editors of the second and third Books of the Psalms changed Jehovah to Elohim for subjective reasons, why may not the author, or editor, of P have changed Jehovah to Elohim in Gen. i. and elsewhere?

¹⁶ P. 90.

¹⁷ P. 287.

¹⁸ *Id.*

Again, why does Haggai have Jehovah 28 times and never Elohim? Why does Zechariah have Jehovah 143 times and Elohim only once? Why does Malachi have Jehovah 46 times and Elohim but once? Why does he appeal to Job as evidence, a book that has Jehovah 32 times and Elohim only 16? Why does Chronicles have Jehovah 547 times and Elohim only 120 times, or Ezra Jehovah 57 times and Elohim but 13? And why does the Greek of Ecclesiasticus written in 180 B.C. have Lord 214 times and God only 11 and the Hebrew " (i.e. Jehovah) 53 times and Elohim only 22? And why does Pirke Aboth use Jehovah 8 times and Elohim but 4?

IV. ADONAY FOR JEHOVAH

Prof. Cheyne says not merely that *Jehovah* was changed into *Elohim*, but that afterwards *Adonay* was substituted for Jehovah (p. 287). If by this substitution he meant merely that the Jews of post-prophetic times came to *read* Adonay for a *written* Jehovah, he is right. But, if he means that the scribes wilfully changed a *written* Jehovah into a *written* Adonay, where are his proofs? He gives none, and there are none to give. That Prof. Cheyne thought that the presence of Adonay in a document was a proof of lateness is manifest from the fact that he says that "Ps. ii. is post-Davidic because of אֲדֹנָי which belongs to the prophetic literature",¹⁹ and that if אֲדֹנָי in Ps. xvi. "means 'the Lord' (absolutely),"²⁰ as Delitzsch assumes, the Psalm is post-Davidic, if not post-exilic."²¹

אֲדֹנָי is found eight times in J, twice in E, four times in JE, twice in Judges, four times in Kings, once in Job, twenty times in Isa. I, once in Isa. II, four times in Ezek., twelve times in Daniel, four times in Amos, twice in Micah, and once each in Zech. and Mal., fourteen times in Lam.; and in the Psalms 12 times in Book I, 14 in Book II, 14 in

¹⁹ *Bampton Lectures*, p. 463.

²⁰ By "absolutely," Prof. Cheyne means "the Lord" rather than "my Lord."

²¹ *Id.*, p. 465.

Book III (9 of them in Ps. lxxxvi.) once in Book IV, and four times in Book V, *i.e.*, 80 times outside the Psalter and 45 times in it.

In Num. xiv. 17 (JE), Gen. xviii. 27 (J), Exodus xxxiv. 9 (JE), 1 Ki. iii. 10, xiii. 4, 2 Ki. vii. 6, xix. 23, Job xxviii. 28, Isa. iii. 17, 18, iv. 4, vi. 1, 8, vii. 14, 20, ix. 7, 16, x. 12, xi. 11, xxi. 6, 16, xxviii. 2, xxix. 13, xxx. 20, xxxvii. 24, xlix. 14, Lam. i. 14, 15 *bis*, ii. 1, 2, 5, 7, 18, 19, 20, iii. 31, 36, 37, 58, Am. vii. 7, 8, ix. 1, Mi. i. 2, Zech. ix. 4, Mal. i. 14 and Dan. i. 2 it is used to denote *the* Lord.²² Since Job and Lamentations are said by the critics to have been written in the sixth century B.C., JE, Isaiah, Amos, Micah, and Kings from 850 to 550 B.C., there remain only Zech. ix. 4 and Mal. i. 14 (without counting the one or two cases in the allegedly late book of Daniel) as post-exilic passages, the critics themselves being witness.²³

If no part of the Hexateuch, nor of Judges, Samuel or Kings, nor of Isaiah, Amos, or Micah, was written before 850 B.C., it is obvious that these works can not witness directly to the use of this term in a document alleged to have been written about 1000 B.C. On the other hand, it is equally obvious that a term that never occurs in *Ecclesiasticus*, the *Pirke Aboth*, nor the *Zadokite Fragments* and but twice in other post-exilic documents cannot be used as evidence for the post-exilic, or even the Maccabean date, of Daniel and of the Psalms in which it occurs. Since JE, Amos, Micah, and Isaiah, all use Jehovah, Elohim, and Adonay, it is probable that David may have used any one or all of these names, or letters, to denote the deity.

What becomes, then, of the implication that the presence of *Adonay* indicates the lateness of a psalm? For while it is true that many of the Hebrew Mss. give the reading Jehovah instead of Adonay, it is not true that Elohim as a variant of Adonay is often found in them; and the argument of Prof. Cheyne is that the psalms of the second

²² The only possible exceptions to this statement are Gen. xviii. 27 and Ex. xxxiv. 9.

²³ LOT, pp. 350, 357, 432, 465, 123, 316, 328, 198, and 206-246.

and third books are post-exilic *because* they contain Elohim and other terms instead of Jehovah. By as much, therefore, as you increase the proportion of Jehovah in the original copies by so much do you weaken any possible argument for their lateness based on the use of other terms.

V. SHADDAI

Mr. Carpenter says²⁴ that "the real key to the Pentateuch may be said to be in Ex. vi. 2-8. In revealing himself *as* the Lord [Jehovah], God affirms that he had not been known *by that name* to the forefathers of Israel; but he had appeared to them *as* El Shaddai. On the basis of these words it would be reasonable to look for traces in Genesis of divine manifestations to the patriarchs under the *title* El Shaddai, and their discovery would afford a presumption that they belonged to the same document [*i.e.*, that Ex. vi. 3 and the parts of Genesis containing divine manifestations under the title El Shaddai belonged to the same document]. On the other hand the occurrence of similar manifestations *in the character* of the Lord would directly contradict the express words of the text, and could not be ascribed to the same author. The distinction which Astruc adopted has thus the direct sanction of the Pentateuch itself."²⁵

I. Inasmuch as Astruc's distinction was based on Jehovah and Elohim, how would this distinction be sanctioned if it could be shown that some of the manifestations of Genesis are "under the title El Shaddai" and some "in the character of Jehovah"? In Genesis, there are only three passages referring to manifestations of the deity in which El Shaddai occurs. In the first, xvii. 1, it is *Jehovah* who appeared unto Abraham and said: "I am *El Shaddai* and I will do" so and so. In the second, xxxv. 7-11, *Elohim* appeared unto Abraham and said: "I am *El Shaddai* and I will do" so and so. In the third, xlviii. 3, Jacob says, *El Shaddai* appeared unto me and blessed me and said unto me I will do so and so. In Ex. vi. 2, 3, "*Elohim* spake

²⁴ In the *Oxford Hexateuch*, p. 33.

²⁵ See also Cheyne in *Bampton Lectures*, p. 84.

unto Moses and said unto him: I am *Jehovah* and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob as *El Shaddai* and as *Shemi Jehovah* I was not made known unto them."

2. If from the above evidence it appears that Elohim is *El Shaddai*, does it not appear, also, that *Jehovah* is *El Shaddai* and that Elohim is *Jehovah*? And does not P in Ex. vi. 2, 3 say expressly that Elohim said that he was *Jehovah* and that he, Elohim *Jehovah*, appeared unto the patriarchs as *El Shaddai*, a mighty God, thus asserting that Elohim, *Jehovah*, and *El Shaddai* were, in the opinion of the author of P, but the names, or titles, of the same person, or of the different attributes, or aspects,²⁶ or relations, of the same God? Again, if the author of P had meant to state in Ex. vi. 2, 3 that God appeared to the patriarchs under the name *El Shaddai*, how does it come that in one of the texts of P where *El Shaddai* is mentioned (Gen. xvii. 1) it is said that *Jehovah* appeared, in another (Gen. xviii. 1) that Elohim appeared, and in only one (Gen. xlvi. 3) that *El Shaddai* appeared? If the critics answer by asserting that *Jehovah* of Gen. xvii. 1 and xxxv. 11 should be changed to *El Shaddai*, the response is that there is just as much evidence for changing the *El Shaddai* of Gen. xlvi. 3 to Elohim or *Jehovah*, or for changing the Elohim of Gen. xxxv. 11 and the *El Shaddai* of xlvi. 3 to *Jehovah*,—that is, no evidence whatever. Further, if the author of P meant that *El Shaddai* was the appellation of the deity known to the patriarchs and that the name of *Jehovah* was first made known to Moses, why does the name *El Shaddai* appear only five times in P up to Ex. vi. 3?

3. If *El Shaddai* was considered by him to be the name of God known to the patriarchs, why does the author of P use Elohim 85 times before Ex. vi. 3, and *El Shaddai* only five times?

4. By what principle, or analogy, of syntax, or language, do the critics render the preposition *beth* by "as" in the

²⁶ LOT, p. 13.

first part of Ex. vi. 3 and supply a "by" in the second part of the same verse? Or, if they tacitly supply שם in the first part of the verse in order to get "under the title El Shaddai," why do they not keep this phrase "under the title" before Jehovah in the second part of the verse, instead of changing it to "in the character of"?

5. Why does Mr. Carpenter not state that he has changed שמי to שם (or at least, used them as equivalents) when he speaks of "the character of the Lord"?²⁷

6. And why in such an important text does he not make a suggestion at least that the primary versions, the Greek, the Syriac, and the Targum of Jonathan, all favor a different text from that presented by our Hebrew textus receptus? The Septuagint has "I am *Kurios*, and I appeared to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob as their God and my name *Kurios* (Lord) I manifested not to them." The Latin Vulgate has "I am Dominus (Lord) who appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as (in) God omnipotent: and my name Adonai I did not make known (*indicavi*) to them." The Targum of Onkelos reads: "I am Jehovah (י) and I was revealed to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, as El Shaddai; and my name (י) I did not make known to them." The Syriac renders: "I am the Lord (*Moryo'*) and I was revealed to Abraham and to Isaac and Jacob as (*b'*) *il Shaddai Aloho'* and the name of the Lord (*Moryo'*) I showed them not." The Arabic of Saadya has: "I am the God who has named myself to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob as (*b*) the Mighty, the Sufficient, and my name *Allahu*." The Samaritan text and version and Kennicott's

²⁷ One might maintain that שמי was a form of the construct of שם with the paragogic Yodh appended as in בני and numerous other examples (Ges. *Heb. Gram.* Cowley's translation) or even that the original writing had been ימי which had afterwards been written out as שמי יהוה instead of the more proper שם יהוה. Or, the whole sentence "my name is Jehovah" might be treated as a genitival nominal sentence (i.e., a sentence used as a noun in the genitive) after the supplied preposition "beth." In this case, Mr. Carpenter would at least be justified in his translations by syntax, and analogously by textual criticism, provided that he rendered *beth* in both clauses by the same word or phrase.

Hebrew Mss. agree substantially with the Hebrew. The Greek uncials all have the same text. It will be seen that all the versions except the Samaritan agree with the Greek LXX in having read הוֹדַעְתִּי instead of נִוְדַעְתִּי ; and that the Syriac took שְׁמִי to be a noun in the construct, or else read simply שֵׁם .

VI. ELYON

Speaking of Psalms xci. and xcii., Prof. Cheyne says²⁸ of the עֲלִיִן (Most High) that is found in the first verse of each, that it is a mark of the late date of the Psalms. Outside of the Psalms, it occurs in Gen. xiv. 18, 19, 20, 22, Num. xxiv. 16, Deut. xxxii. 8, 2 Sam. xxii. 14, Isa. xiv. 14, Lam. iii. 35, 38. In the Psalms it occurs in vii. 18, ix. 3, xviii. 14, and xxi. 8 of Book I; xlvi. 5, xlvii. 3, lvii. 3 of Book II; lxxvii. 11, lxxviii. 17, 35, 56, lxxxii. 6, lxxxv. 19, lxxxvii. 5, lxxxix. 28 of Book III; xci. 1, xcii. 2, xcvii. 9 of Book IV; and in cvii. 11 of Book V. In the Aramaic portion of Daniel its equivalent is found fourteen times. In the Apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature²⁹ it occurs as follows:

	Tobit.	1Esdr.	Noah	Sir.	2En.	Sib.	Jub.	Jud.	XIIPat.
<i>Most High</i>	2	0	3	19	2	2	2	0	18
<i>Most High God.</i> 1*		3	0	9	0	1	21	1	1

	Add.			Assump.				
	3En.	2Mac.	to Est.	6En.	3Mac.	Wisd.	Moses	Zad.
<i>Most High</i>	1	1	0	9	1	1	1	1
<i>Most High God.</i> 0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0

	Odes		Sal.	Ezra	Eagle	S. of M. Ezra		
	Sol.	2 Bar.	Ap.	Ap.	Vis.	Vis.	Piece	Tot'l
<i>Most High</i>	23	25	46	7	9	6	2	181
<i>Most High God.</i> 1		0	0	0	0	0	0	40

* Syriac version.

²⁸ *Bampton Lectures*, p. 73.

²⁹ In the New Testament "The Most High God" occurs only in Mark v. 7, Heb. vii. 7 (a citation from Gen. xiv. 18) and in Luke viii. 28 and Acts xvi. 17. "The Most High" is found only in Luke's works. Luke i. 32, 35, 36, vi. 35, Acts vii. 48.

It will be observed that whereas **עליא** is employed ten times in the Aramaic portion of Daniel, the Hebrew word **עליון** is not found at all in the Hebrew portion. It should be observed, further, that in iii. 26, 32, iv. 14, 21, 22, 29, 31, v. 18, 21, (that is, in all cases except vii. 25 where **עליא** occurs) it is used either by, to, or of, Nebuchadnezzar. This is especially significant in view of the fact that Nebuchadnezzar uses the corresponding Babylonian word *širu* of Ninmena, Ninkanak, Ninmak, Gula, Shamash, and Marduk. He uses also *šaku* "High" of Marduk as does Nabunaid.³⁰ These gods all were *high* but the God of Daniel was *The High*, or (since an adjective in the Aramaic is made superlative by the article)³¹ "the Most High."

The word **עליונין** of Dan. vii. 18, 22, 25, 27 is found nowhere else either in Aramaic, nor (in its plural form) in Hebrew. The phrase "saints of the Most High" does not occur in the Apocryphal or Pseudepigraphical literature except in the Zad. Frag. ix. 33,³² written about 40 A.D.; nor is it found in either Old Testament or New Testament.

The use, therefore, of **עליונין** by Daniel is unique and that of **עליא** is appropriate to his surroundings at Babylon.³³

But, aside from these convincing facts, one may be pardoned for asking the critics what titles for God a writer of Aramaic in the sixth century B.C. might have used that would be more appropriate than **עליא**. *Jehovah* is never found in any Aramaic dialect nor is *El* nor *Adonay* nor *Elohim* nor *Shaddai* though Daniel employs all of these, except the last, in the Hebrew portions of the book. His

³⁰Zehnpfund-Langdon: *Neubab. Königsinschriften*, pp. 67, 77, 84, 102, 108, 112, 156, 234.

³¹See Duval: *Grammaire Syriacque*, p. 346.

³²Page 20, line 8 of the Hebrew text of Schechter, the Hebrew is **קדשי עליון**.

³³That **עליון** was used for God among the Phoenicians and Carthaginians appear from the use of **Ἐλίουθ** by Philo Byblus (see Eusebius: *Praef.*, evang. 1:10) and of *Alonim Velonuth* by Plautus in the *Poen.* v. 1, 1; and also in the proper name Abdalonimus. (See Gesenius under **עליון**).

failure to use **יְהוָה** of God except in ii.47 (where Nebuchadnezzar uses it) and v. 23 (in addressing Belshazzar) probably shows that the use of Lord for Jehovah had not yet become the fashion, and argues in favor of the earlier date for the book.³⁴

VII. JAH

Prof. Cheyne states³⁵ that besides Ps. lxviii. 5, 19 and Ex. xv. 2, xvii. 16, and Cant. viii. 6 **יה** occurs "forty-two times in Biblical passages which on various grounds are all most probably (I speak within bounds) either Exilic or post-Exilic. I base no argument on the infrequency of **יהוה** in Ps. lviii. (only vss. 17, 21) as compared with **אֲדֹנָי** (six times), as such phenomena may be due, or partly due, to the editor and the scribes."

That Adonay *may* have been inserted in the text instead of Jehovah for which it was read must be granted, just as it is granted in the case of any Kre; but this is very different from granting that the Kres *were* thus written into the text. It is a mere conjecture, or opinion, of Prof. Cheyne's; for there is no sufficient evidence in manuscripts to show that such an insertion of Adonay instead of Jehovah was ever made. Ecclesiasticus never has Adonay at all. Jehovah occurs alone in the Old Testament about 6500 times and Adonay only 126 times. Adonay occurs in 17 out of 39 books and Jehovah in 37. The following table shows the relative number of times in the 17 books in which both occur:

	Gen.	Ex.	Nu.	Josh.	Ju.	1 Ki.	2 Ki.	Isa.	Lam.
<i>Jehovah</i>	146	377	389	225	179	253	278	421	31
<i>Adonay</i>	7	6	1	1	2	2	2	22	14

	Ezek.	Dan.	Am.	Mi.	Zech.	Mal.	Ps.	Job.
<i>Jehovah</i>	193	7	59	37	143	46	664	32
<i>Adonay</i>	4	11	4	1	1	1	45	1

³⁴ The appropriateness of the use of Lord in connection with the kings of Babylon will be recognized by all who read the Babylonian inscriptions, where *Bel*, "Lord," frequently occurs.

³⁵ BL, p. 124.

That the presence of Adonay in a document does not argue for its lateness is evident from the fact that it occurs 14 times in JE and never in either D, H, or P; 21 times in the part of Isaiah admitted by Dr. Driver to be authentic and only once in the other parts of Isaiah; never in Jeremiah and only four times in Ezekiel; four times in Amos, once in Micah, and only once each in Zechariah and Malachi; twice each in Judges, 1 Kings and 2 Kings and never in Chronicles, Ezra, or Nehemiah; in the Psalter 12 times in Book I, 14 times in Book II, 14 times in Book III, and only 5 times in Books IV. and V. together.

VIII. THE NAME

Prof. Cheyne asserts³⁶ that in Lev. xxiv. 11 "a later scribe (surely not the original writer) sought by substituting השם for יהוה to avoid an unpleasant collocation. Possibly, too, he is responsible for the insertion of שם before יהוה in v. 16." He says, also, on the same page that "the Name" was used in the time of Sirach as a substitute for Jehovah, "since it was doubtless inexpedient to 'name the Holy One' frequently in conversation."

Are not these rather extravagant statements in view of the fact that the use of "the Name" to designate the deity is found only once out of nearly 4000 designations occurring in the twenty-nine books of Jewish literature outside the Old Testament?³⁷ This single example is met with in Pirke Aboth v. 11 and cannot be shown to be earlier than the second century A.D.

Besides, Pirke Aboth uses " eight times, Elohim four times, and El once, "the Name" being found but once out of forty-three designations of the deity. Sirach uses "" fifty-three times and "the Name" never.

IX. THE HOLY ONE

Prof. Cheyne tells us³⁸ that the Holy One was a common substitute for Jehovah in the time of Sirach and after.

³⁶ BL, p. 300.

³⁷ See the lists of titles of God in this REVIEW for January, 1920.

³⁸ BL, P. 300.

That קדוש might have been used frequently for the deity is admitted. It is thus used in Isa. x. 17, Hab. i. 12, iii. 3, Prov. xxx. 4, and Job vi. 10. In the Apocryphal and Pseudo-epigraphical literature it occurs twice in Ecclesiasticus, once each in 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 Enoch, twice in Book III of the Sibylline Oracles, two or three times in 1 Baruch, and four times in Pirke Aboth, *i.e.*, 15 or 16 times out of nearly four thousand. In the Targum of Onkelos it is never used for God. In the New Testament it occurs only in 1 John ii. 20. So that, while it must be admitted that it might have been used commonly to designate the deity in place of Jehovah, the evidence for its ever having been so used would be restricted to Pirke Aboth where it occurs 4 times out of 43 designations of the deity, to wit, in iii. 1, 4, v. 6, 7. Not one of these verses can be shown to be earlier than the second century A.D.

X. HEAVEN

Prof. Cheyne says³⁹ that "heaven" as a substitute for Jehovah is "frequent in 1 Maccabees." This statement is made in a note illustrative of his argument that the psalms are post-exilic and many of them come from Maccabean times. He asserts that Yahweh was changed into Elohim and afterwards into Adonay⁴⁰ and that in Sirach's time (*i.e.* in the 2nd century B.C.) "substitutes like 'heaven,' or 'the name,' or 'the Holy One,' would generally meet every need" implied "in the name Jahweh."

It is certainly an exaggeration to say that "heaven" is a frequent designation of God in 1 Maccabees inasmuch as it is found in **§** A V and the Syriac only in iii. 19 and xvi. 3. In iii. 18 the Syriac reads "the inhabitant of heaven" and **§** V "the God of heaven."

Further, there is no more reason for saying that "heaven" is used for Jehovah than for Elohim or Eloah or Adonay, since neither Lord nor God occurs in 1 Maccabees. In xiv. 28 the Saramel (or Asaramel of **§** V) may possibly be

³⁹ BL, p. 300, Note.

⁴⁰ *Id.*, p. 287.

שַׂרְעֵמָאֵל the prince of the people of God. In this case אֵל will have occurred once in the original Hebrew. It is worthy of note, however, that the Syriac renders this by Israel. Only one other designation of the deity is found in 1 Maccabees, *i.e.*, in iv. 30 where we find "the Savior of Israel."

"Heaven" is found twice in 2 Maccabees (written possibly about 100 B.C.), vii. 11 and ix. 20. In vii. 11, the Syriac has "inhabitant of the heavens" and in ix. 20 "God who is in heaven." Besides, the name occurs in Susannah vi. 9 and in the 3rd Sibylline Book, l. 247, and once in a pre-Christian saying of the Pirke Aboth.

That is, counting all cases, "heaven" occurs from four to nine times out of about 3000 designations of God occurring in the pre-Christian apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature of the Jews. In the Old Testament it occurs only in the Aramaic of Daniel in his address to Nebuchadnezzar in iv. 23, making one instance out of 94 to 98 designations of God in the Aramaic of Daniel, and one out of about 190 in the whole of Daniel, of which 123 are *Eloah* or *Elohim*.

Obviously, as a substitute, "heaven" did not often serve. Is it not extraordinary, to say the least, that it was never thus substituted in "P" or Ecclesiastes, or Joel, or Jonah, or especially in the Maccabean psalms? Is it not remarkable, also, that it is not substituted in the LXX., or in the Targums, or in the Peshitto and Latin Vulgate? And finally, what proof is there that the writers who employed it used it for Jehovah rather than for Elohim or Adonay? In 1 Maccabees and 2 Maccabees, the Syriac puts for it "the God of heaven." It is true that neither book ever uses Lord, but this is equally true as to Elohim. Susannah uses "heaven" once, Lord 98 times and God 79 times.

The Sibylline Oracles almost certainly mean "heaven" as a "substitute" or synonym for God. My own conjecture is that it was used instead of the fuller "God of heaven" just as we use Marlborough and Wellington for the dukes of those places.

XI. GOD OF HEAVEN

Dr. Driver claimed that the title "God of heaven" is post-exilic and that its alleged occurrence in Jonah i. 9 is a proof that the book of Jonah is post-exilic.⁴¹

The lists published in the January number of this REVIEW show that in pre-Christian writings this title occurs as follows:

	Tobit	1 Esd.	Noah	Sib.	Jub.	Jud. XII	Pat.	3 Mac.
<i>God of Heaven</i> ...	2 or 3	3	1	2	3	2	1	1
<i>All Titles for God.</i>	42	144	42	127	356	24	392	34

That is, the title "God of heaven" counts up but 16 out of the 1161 designations of God found in these books and only 19 out of the 2968 in the 29 books where titles are listed. Since 1 Esdras is based on the biblical Ezra where this title occurs 8 times, and both Jubilees and the XII. Patriarchs on Genesis where the phrase occurs four times in composition, seven of the total of 15 should be eliminated as imitations or citations. 3 Mac. was written at the earliest in the 1st. century B.C. The discovery of the Aramaic of Ahikar renders it probable that Tobit was written in the Persian period. So that there are left only five examples of the use of the phrase in documents written at a time approximating the date ascribed to Daniel by the critics, *i.e.*, the 2nd century B.C.

If, however, we put Tobit in the Persian period, we shall have to add 2 cases of its use in that period to the 8 found in Ezra and the 3 in Nehemiah, making 14 cases of its use in Persian times, without counting Daniel, or the composite titles in Genesis, Jonah, Chronicles and Ezra i. 2.

Next, it is proper to inquire what evidence there is that the title "God of heaven" was used by nations outside the Jews. The critics have produced no examples of its use in Greek documents and I have been unable thus far to discover any. Turning to the Babylonian, Persian, and Phoenician, however, we find similar titles among all three.

⁴¹ LOT, p. 322.

Already in the Code of Hammurabi we read⁴² of "Bel lord of heaven and earth"⁴³ and in the epilogue, of "Sin, the lord of heaven" and of "Shamash, the great judge of heaven and earth."⁴⁴ Tiglath-Pileser I (1100 B.C.) also uses this last title.⁴⁵ Nebuchadnezzar speaks of "Marduk king of heaven and earth."

Darius, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes III., have all left inscriptions referring to Ahuramazda as the great God who made heaven and earth.⁴⁶

The Phoenician inscriptions refer to a Baal-shamen, (בלשמן) or lord of heaven.

It will be noted that in all cases (except Ps. cxxxvi.) the phrase is used in the Old Testament only in portions which have to do with foreigners. Jonah is addressing mariners, probably Phoenicians, when he speaks of Jehovah as the God of heaven who made the sea and the dry-land. Abraham in Gen. xxiv. is about to send Eliazer of Damascus to Laban over in Mesopotamia. Besides he had come out of Ur Kasdim, at the time, and almost from the capital city, of Hammurabi (Gen. xiv.)

That Daniel living at Babylon from 600 to 530 B.C. may have used the title in matters concerning the kings of Babylon is evident from both the Babylonian and Persian inscriptions.

Whenever the 136th psalm may have been written, it is sure that the title "God of heaven" argues, so far as monumental evidence is concerned, for a period earlier than the Greek conquest. It contains the only instance known of the use of אל God before the word for heaven.

⁴² In the prologue to the Code.

⁴³ *ilu En-lil be-el ša-me-e u ir-ši-tim.*

⁴⁴ *ilu Sin be-el ša-me-e* and *ilu šamaš da-a-a-nu-um ra-bi-um ša ša-me-e u ir-ši-tim.*

⁴⁵ Col. i. 7.

⁴⁶ So Darius Persepolis g, Naksh-i-Rustam a, Suez e; Xerxes, Persepolis a, b, c, d, Elwend, Van; and Artaxerxes, Persepolis. There are slight variations in these inscriptions, but none affecting the points indicated.

XII. JEHOVAH ELOHIM

Gen. ii.4-iii. is attributed by the critics to J. Jehovah Elohim occurs in this passage 19 times, Elohim 3 times and Jehovah alone never. Jehovah-Elohim occurs besides, according to the critics, in no pre-exilic passage except Ex. ix. 30 (J), and 2 Sam. vii. 22, 26; but it is found 8 times in Chronicles, once in Jonah and in the Korahite psalm lxxxiv. Why, then, should Gen. ii. 4-iii. not be late because the combination is found in Chronicles; or Jonah and Psalm lxxxiv. not be early because it is found in J?

XIII. JEHOVAH OF HOSTS

Jehovah of hosts is found ten times in 1 Sam.; forty-one times in Isa. I, and nine times in Amos. Why is it never found in J or E? It occurs thirty-four times in Jeremiah, why never in D? It occurs 86 times in Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, why never in H or P? Why only in three psalms, one in Book I (xxiv. 10), one in Book II (xlvi. 8, 12), and one in Book III (lxxxiv. 2, 4, 13)?

XIV. ADONAY JEHOVAH

Why do the critics, who are so cock-sure about Shaddai, Elyon, Jehovah, and Elohim, not explain how Ezekiel came to use Adonay Jehovah 217 times out of the 293 instances in the Old Testament? Why especially is it found in none of the prophets later than Ezekiel (except once in Zechariah), nor in Jonah or Joel, which the critics allege to be later? Why is it never found in H or P which were influenced by Ezekiel, if not actually based upon it?

Many other questions and conclusions will be suggested by an examination of the lists; not merely of those for the Old Testament, but also of those for the Koran, and the other Jewish books. Thus, while it is remarkable that Ecclesiastes uses Elohim alone, it is little less remarkable that Proverbs uses Jehovah 84 times, Elohim 3 times, and all other designations but twice. It is noteworthy, also, that outside the Psalms, no compound titles are found in

any poetical work except seven in Job, five with *Elohim* and two with *Eloah*. Furthermore, that an author should use a multiplicity of different forms of the designations for the deity is not a proof of a late age as is presumed by Prof. Cheyne in his remarks on Ps. lxviii. For Isa. I uses 30 forms, Isa. II, 24 forms, Jer., 21 forms, and Ezekiel only 12. Micah has 13 forms and Amos 10 while Haggai has only 3 and Zechariah 8. Proverbs has 6 and Ecclesiastes only one. In the Psalms, Book I has 16, II, 28, III, 21, IV, 15, and V, 12 forms. In works probably from the 2nd century B.C., Ecclesiasticus has 22, Book III of the Sib. Oracles 38, Jubilees 32, Judith 12, the XII Pat. 20, 1 Mac. 3, 2 Mac. 24. Judging from titles would not the author of Ecclesiastes have felt rather lonesome among this much titled galaxy?

That the use of different designations for the deity in different parts of a book may afford a strong argument for or against the unity of authorship is illustrated in many books. Thus 2 Macc. has 9 titles in the first eight chapters that are not found in the last seven, 11 titles in the last seven not found in the first eight, and only 3 common to both parts; and 1 Baruch has 5 titles in the first three chapters and different ones in the last two and only the title God in common. On the other hand, Ecclesiasticus, whose unity has not been doubted, has 16 titles occurring only in chapters xxx-li. and only 6 in i-xxix, of which all occur also in xxx-li.

Hoping that the lists of designations of the Deity that have now been published may serve in part as a sure objective foundation of fact upon which to construct a really scientific history of the literature of the ancient Israelites, I bid adieu for the time being to my arduous task. Future textual criticism and the correction of oversights and mistakes may cause slight changes in some of the enumerations and conclusions; but let the reader, whoever he be, take notice that this vast mass of testimony cannot be overthrown by innuendoes and subjective considerations.

Princeton.

ROBERT DICK WILSON.

THE RITSCHLIANS AND THE PREEXISTENCE OF CHRIST

But since Satan, in order to subvert the very foundations of our faith, has always been exciting great contentions concerning the Divine essence of the Son and Spirit, and the distinction of the Persons, and in almost all ages has instigated impious spirits to vex the orthodox teachers on this account; and is also endeavoring, in the present day, with the old embers, to kindle a new flame; it becomes necessary here to refute the perverse and fanciful notions which some persons have imbibed.

—JOHN CALVIN.

There is a passage in Goethe's *Faust* where the hero undertakes to explain the meaning of the word "Logos." He says: "It is written, 'In the beginning was the Word.' But this is impossible, the Word alone cannot be prized so highly. I therefore translate: In the beginning was the Sense. Sense by itself, however, could not create. Let me try Power then. But no, this will not do either. I think Deed would pass. All right: 'Εν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, In the beginning was the Deed." Of course, this is not theology; it is poetry. But why should not a poet grant himself certain liberties, even when stepping upon the foreign soil of theology, if he does not consider that which is written authoritative? Or why should theologians, who no longer recognize Scripture as an objective rule for theological thinking, stop halfway between flatly denying certain truths that have been dug out of the gold mine of God's Word and still holding to those truths? Naturally there is no theologian among the disciples of Albrecht Ritschl who would dispose of an exegetical question in such an arbitrary way as we have heard the German poet doing. But why not take a lesson in consistency—a hard lesson, if need be—from a man who does not care what the words of others imply, and boldly steps to the front with an "And that is what I say it must mean"?

There are a number of things which are most surely believed among us, that are denied by this influential school of thinkers. But the chief danger lies in the fact that they

do not openly deny them, but rather claim to believe them with us. Among these are the important points of the pre-existence of Christ and the mode of His pre-existent Being. To be sure, the Christian Church has dealt with the problem in a definite way; she has arrived at her explanation of Christ's pre-existence through exegesis of the passages of Scripture dealing with it, and she has made the result of those studies the foundation of her Christology. But the Ritschlians tell us that not Scripture so much as Christian experience, or, Scripture only so far as it is in harmony with Christian experience, should be the source of our information. And they assert that since the matter of Christ's pre-existence involves a dark problem, we should begin at the other end, where the light shines clearly; which means that we should start with Christ's earthly appearance and from this base build upward until finally the entire statue of Christ may be finished, ending in the climactic confession of His divine pre-existence. And certainly in erecting their statue they seem to make use of the same material, which always has been in use. They employ the same language and utilize the identical designations, such as Son of God, Only-begotten, Logos, and the like.

Is there, then, any danger arising from the different method applied? Is it wrong to begin with the humanity of Jesus and to show that it was such a glorious and wonderful humanity that he, in spite of this truly human appearance, was not and could not be a mere human being, but was God also? Is it wrong to say that He was God because he appeared to be divine, altho a true man, and to conclude that if He was divine on earth He must have been divine before His birth, but—of course—with such a divinity as he had on earth, one, that is, which is compatible with his true humanity? Is the pre-existence of Christ the foundation or the roof of the structure of our Christology? Is the mode of His pre-existent being dependent upon or independent of the mode of His human being?

That is the problem. And it is the purpose of this paper

to show that the theologian who desires to keep his divine Christ, must begin with His preëxistence, viewed in and for itself; and that the Ritschlian method of dealing with the Saviour's preëxistence is bound to end in a Christology without a divine Christ. To this end we shall take up a few of the Ritschlian authors, trace their line of thought and show how their own works make them known.

Dr. W. Beyschlag's *New Testament Theology* may be considered a fair sample of the theological views of the older Ritschlians. The Tübingen School as well as Ritschl appear to have strongly influenced the Halle professor.¹

Not only in the Synoptics, he informs us, but also in John, Jesus "marks Himself out, according to every law of logic and language, as a being, who is not God, but man." The expression "Son of Man" indicates that Jesus was true and mere man. The term "Son of God" is used by the Baptist (1:34) "because he had seen the Messianic anointing of this child of man." And whatever Jesus Himself testified concerning the Son of God, "all that does not go beyond the idea of the favorite and chosen among the children of men, whom God had entrusted with His highest mission." It would seem (be it remarked in passing), that Jesus' contemporaries saw a little more in His claim to Sonship of God; according to them it was blasphemy to be punished with death (Matt. 26:63-66, Mk. 14:61-64), since by saying that God was His Father, He made Himself equal with God (John 5:18). But to proceed, Dr. Beyschlag tells us that not even the term "the Only Begotten Son" means anything more. And to prove this he refers to Luke 7:12! As it is said there that the woman of Nain had a υἱὸς μονόγενῆς "only son," in the case of Jesus the word must also mean "that he was an only child." But in the same breath almost, he says: "It simply expresses the uniqueness of the relation of Sonship in which Jesus stands to God." This is a little puzzling. If the word μονόγενῆς has the same meaning in both cases, it must either mean that the woman

¹ *New Testament Theology*, 2nd English Edition, Vol. I, p. 239 ff.

had more sons, although the one spoken of stood in a unique relation to her, was her favorite son, which is incompatible with the story; or, Jesus also must be the only Son of God, and not merely a favorite one, which Beyschlag denies. And the exegesis of John 10:33-38, which is called the most important passage for the testimony of Jesus to Himself, can be explained in such a way as to make it teach that Jesus was only the messenger of the Father. But it might equally well mean, even if we take it apart from other passages, that the Jews, even from their viewpoint, which need not be Jesus' standpoint, had no reason to rebuke Him. Such a passage then, proves very little.

According to Dr. Beyschlag Jesus had a "purely human form of consciousness," (§4) an assertion which it is easy to prove after the method of his criticism. There are numerous passages which teach that our Lord was true man and there are those which emphasize the human side of His being. But we also find a number of statements in which the other, non-human side of His being, is dwelt upon. We therefore apply the first kind of statements only to Jesus as man. But Beyschlag's method is different. He takes up the passages in which Jesus speaks of His human consciousness, and immediately applies them to the entire Jesus Christ, and exclaims, Now do you not see that Jesus was man? Then, afterwards, he explains the other texts as only seemingly teaching the deity of Christ. But how is this to be harmonized with the heading of the paragraph on Christ's "Sinlessness and Oneness with God" (§5) which immediately follows? "Christ's," we read, "was a human heart, distinguished from all others by the fact that it cherished nothing ungodly, nothing that separated it from God; He was related to God in pure humility, childlikeness and obedient love, and in Him, for that very reason, the eternal holy God was able to make His dwelling-place as in no other. In Him God dwelt, full of grace and truth (1:14); and so in this human heart God's perfect revelation, His true incarnation, has now taken place: 'He that hath seen me hath

seen the Father.'” But is not this sole sinless man, who never yields to temptation and always pleases the Father, if he is not God, an even greater mystery than the God-man Jesus Christ of the Bible and the orthodox faith? Why did he never sin, if he was made from the same material as the rest of us? If, then, the author asks us: “What need of faith does this Christology leave unsatisfied? What is wanting in the Christ so understood, to make His being the perfect Mediator between God and man?” our answer is: Your Mediator is only an example. And since my own life seems to teach me and the history of civilization shows that men are unable to follow this example, we need something more.

But does not the mere putting of that question, right here, seem to imply that Beyschlag’s Christology is complete even before the preexistence of Christ is touched upon? Indeed it does; and not until the deity of the historical Jesus has been denied in the foregoing paragraphs, is paragraph 6 introduced, which informs us that “the idea of preexistence” is unknown to the Synoptics; and a paragraph 8 on “The Several Utterances concerning Preexistence.” He finds them in John 6:62; 8:58; 17:5; 17:24. All these passages prove that the preexistence of Christ as ideal man is meant. But that exegesis of these passages is based upon the “Historical and Psychological Explanation of it,” viz. of the *idea of preexistence*, given before (§7). It is simply this, that in the circles to which Jesus historically belonged, “everything holy and divine on earth,” was traced back to a heavenly original in which it existed before its earthly appearance; thus the tabernacle (Heb. 8:5), the city of Jerusalem (Gal. 4:26; Rev. 21:10), and especially the Kingdom of God. Of this Kingdom of God Jesus knew that it was prepared for the pious from the beginning of the world; it was the Alpha and the Omega of the thought of God. He also knew Himself to be its personal bearer. “How much more then must He Himself have been pre-existent.” Hence He said: “Before Abraham was, I am.”

He consequently had only "*a sort of ideal preëxistence*" in the decree of God. If John did not conceive of it in this way, it is none the less true, for Jesus Himself did so in the above mentioned passages which are the only four declarations giving a true representation of Christ's dealing with the subject. The term "a sort of ideal preëxistence," however, does not imply that it was unreal, but only that we cannot define it any better, for: "the originals in heaven are more and not less real than the phenomena of earth," just as Plato's ideas were to him realities.

In harmony with this explanation Beyschlag now instructs us that the "Son of Man" of 6:62 is pure man and not "a second God." The exegesis of, "Before Abraham was, I am" as "a flashing up in Him like a mental vision of the consciousness of eternal preëxistence, because in such an excited moment His understanding of Himself for a moment reached its height and went beyond the permanent background of His thoughts about Himself," as well as the explanation of the other two passages, starts from the pre-conception that Jesus conceived of Himself as ideal man, but not as God. And why not? Beyschlag's Christology was completed before the preëxistence of Christ was considered, and why should not His preëxistence be explained in harmony with the system? A God-man Christ Jesus did not exist and thus when the man Jesus in 17:5 asks for a glory in heaven which he had before, he also had this glory beforehand as a man. And that the historic Jesus was a man in the same sense in which others are men, is evident from 17:22-26; "or how," asks Beyschlag, "would that participation in the same love and glory which the eternal Father gives to the Son be at all conceivable in the case of other men, if this Son were a being *toto coelo* different from believers, and had not preëxisted in God from the first as the Son of Man, the first born of many brethren?" We remark in passing that this question excludes the possibility of the idea that God loved us in and through Christ. Beyschlag's way of dealing with the preëxistence of Christ is

part of a system according to which all men, including Christ, are the same in God's eyes, viz. men whom He loves. But the words, "I have given them," clearly show the different origin of the two glories spoken of.

It seems, however, as if the writer of this *New Testament Theology* realizes that this way of dealing with the preexistence of Christ is rather insufficient. At least the next paragraph, "Heavenly Mission and Descent," begins with this question: "But is not the Gospel, apart from those four passages, full of the consciousness of preexistence and indeed of such a preexistence as presupposes a personal passing over from the higher world into the earthly, and with it the remembrance of a personal existence in that higher world?" The reader may feel at ease about that; he is informed that this only seems so to "those who read the Gospel through the spectacles of dogmatic tradition." Wherever we read that Christ came "into the world" (if we only read through the spectacles of Ritschlian tradition), it either means that the man Jesus entered into "the world of public life," or that he came into the world as every babe comes into it. When it is said, Christ came "from heaven," or "from above," "from God and not from this world," this, according to Beyschlag, could be said as well of Jesus' fellowmen, as indeed He Himself said, "they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." And obviously, there is a certain likeness between Christ and those whom He makes like unto Himself; but do not verses six and eight of John 17 imply that before Christ has wrought that certain change in them which is the very end of His earthly mission, the same "they are not of the world" could not be applied to Christ's followers? For there it is said of them that they were given unto Christ "out of the world," while it is said concerning Christ, "I have come from with Thee." But besides this fact it will be a difficult task to find the other expressions which denote the same view of Jesus' descent used with regard to man's descent; such as "to be," "to come," "to have come down," "to have descended from

above, out of heaven, from (ἐκ), or from with (παρά) the Father."

Having reached this point Beyschlag has to explain why Jesus showed knowledge of at least a few heavenly things which others did not know. To this the next paragraph is devoted, "The Source from which He derives His knowledge of Heavenly Things" (§10). If Christ was not pre-existent as God, the Father did not give Him a revelation fundamentally different from the revelation we receive. The arguments which the author uses to prove that this is the case seem even weaker than some of the foregoing. If we refer phrases such as "that which I have seen with my Father" (8:38), "the truth which I have heard of God" (8:40), to the preëxistent Christ, this does not imply, as Beyschlag seems to think, that the Logos is "thought of as a child, sitting at the Father's feet, in order to be taught by Him, in order to see and hear the eternal facts and truths." The explanation that Jesus saw and heard in the spiritual sense as the prophets received their revelations, does not do justice to the expression *παρὰ τῷ θεῷ*. In the same sense, says Beyschlag, in order to strengthen his position, Jesus says of Himself and the Baptist in common (3:11), "We speak what we know and testify what we have seen." But it is a fantastic contention, which is not taken from the narrative, that this "we" includes the Baptist.^{1a} And further, that Jesus only in a higher sense and with greater truth than Moses claimed that He saw God face to face and that therefore "in doing so He just as little places it in the preëxistent state as Moses' seeing of God was placed by the Old Testament in a preëxistent state"—is an argument which loses its force from the mere fact that Moses did not see God face to face, as is evident from Ex.

^{1a} But granted this "we" includes the Baptist, or even all the Old Testament prophets (A. Kuyper, *Pro Rege*, vol. III, p. 374; Godet, *Comm.*, in loco, thinks rather of the disciples) so that Jesus speaks here of his prophetic inspiration, that would not deny his being more than a prophet and the *παρὰ τῷ θεῷ* of 8.38 would still stand in a class by itself.

33:20, where God says that no man could see His face and live. The doubtful words in Num. 12:18 "the similitude of the Lord" (תִּמְנַת יְהוָה) therefore must mean something else than "face" (פָּנִים). And when it is said in Ex. 33:11 that God *spoke* unto Moses face to face, this does not necessarily include Moses' *seeing* God face to face.

From this standpoint it is, of course, easy for Beyschlag to explain passages like John 8:38, 15:15 and 3:13 in such a way that the idea of preëxistence is altogether excluded; and accordingly he arrives at the "Conclusion" (§11) that in John, Jesus, no more than in the Synoptics, teaches His preëxistence as a divine being. "In its portrayal of Jesus it [the Gospel of St. John] shows us how deep a sense He had of being a stranger on the earth, although He took a loving interest in everything human; it shows His feeling, that His true home was in a higher world, and at the same time His majestic consciousness of being the realization in a human life of God's love, the personal realization of the Eternal in time."

With this "ideal preëxistence," as taught by Beyschlag, P. Lobstein, himself an outspoken Ritschlian, does not agree. Its value, he tells us, is purely negative, hence obviously insufficient.² Lobstein proposes another solution, which he calls the "teleological conception of the eternal and personal election of the Son of God with a view to the work of salvation." This, he claims, "safeguards at once the religious interest which has inspired the formula of the personal preëxistence and the critical intention which has suggested the thesis of the ideal preëxistence."³ According to Lobstein in his treatise on the Preëxistence of Christ the formula of the personal preëxistence of the Saviour is not the starting-point of the Church's Christology, but rather the "highest expression" to which the Church came in thinking out the problem of the divinity of Christ. Without it

² *La Notion de la Préexistence du Fils de Dieu*. Fragment de Christologie Expérimentale par P. Lobstein. Paris, Librairie Fischbacher, 1883, pp. 150, 142, 143.

³ P. 22, 23.

the early Church found herself unable to understand the scope of the divine revelation which appeared in Jesus Christ. From this it follows that the theologian should be conscious of the relativity of the value of this "formula," as it is the product of a theological reflection and of an interpretation of Scripture, both of which are subjective. Hence Lobstein is of the opinion that, in dealing as a theologian with the Christological problem, he is only permitted to start from the primitive and spontaneous expression of faith and not from the result of theological thinking, as a normative authority.^{3a}

It may safely be said, however, that this is a mere assertion with Lobstein, and that no documentary evidence is furnished to support it. One looks in vain for proof of the statement that the personal preëxistence of Christ is not the starting-point of the Christology of the different New Testament authors when their teachings are discussed. Nor could any proof be given. Lobstein's assertion is the result of an axiom, a dogma, which underlies his entire Christology. This axiom is that all theology is the result of experience.⁴ To him there is no such thing as an objective truth. There is no inspired Bible. Accordingly whenever Paul or John had the same "experience" as the Ritschlians have, they may be tolerated. But no sooner does Lobstein *feel* differently from Paul than the apostle is pronounced to be in the dangerous sphere of "metaphysics," and we have to go back to his "original" or "primitive" conceptions, which exclude the notion of a personal preëxistence. And thus he can declare at the end that he agrees with Paul and still holds to the much coveted claim (why so much coveted?) of being Pauline and Christian, even though he be a follower rather of A. Ritschl. This representation which indeed contains a serious accusation we shall try to make good as briefly as possible.

Chapter II bears the title, "The Pauline Christology."

^{3a} Pp. 22, 23.

⁴ *Op Cit.* pp. 26, 27, 31, 31, 69, etc. Note also the sub-title, "*Fragment de Christologie Expérimentale.*"

Here we read that the cause (*principe*) and the object of the apostle's faith was the resurrected and glorified Christ, whom he had seen on the road to Damascus and whose sovereign intervention had wrought a radical transformation in his consciousness.⁵ Now, why not admit that this appearance of the glorified Christ was a supernatural revelation? Or, why deny the possibility or even the likelihood that this same Christ would reveal Himself to the same Paul and give him some more information concerning Himself and the message He wanted to preach, rather than imagine that Christ, after having appeared to Paul on the Damascus road, would let the newly converted apostle-to-be shift for himself? In the first case—and the one which seems the more natural consequence of the appearance,—we might expect that Paul the apostle had received a trustworthy report concerning the person and work of Christ which he in turn transmitted to us. And we would be able to understand why the apostle writes with such great authority as one having the Spirit of the Lord. But to Lobstein that was the only revelation Christ imparted to Paul and accordingly the above cited sentence is immediately followed by these words: "Let us try to develop the theological consequences which result *from this religious experience*" (*Italics ours*). When he thus comes into contact with Christ, the believer (others as well as Paul) finds in himself a new life, the inspiration of a spirit, which lifts him far above all previous experiences; from which he concludes that Christ is, in some way, the divine originator of this divine experience. Hence the assertion that Christ is divine finds its roots in a "religious judgment pronounced by the conscience of the Christian community."⁶

But does not the Christian Church cherish a vain illusion in regarding the Lord as the origin of these spiritual gifts? Is not this a purely subjective opinion on her part? Far from it; for it is strongly supported by the double fact of the

⁵ P. 26.

⁶ P. 28.

death and resurrection of Christ. The resurrection of Christ is the creation and the revelation of a spiritual humanity having no more anything in common with the flesh, sin and death; it is at once the foundation and the guarantee of a new and divinely inspired life. But, this resurrection being such, it explains the death of Christ as the condemnation of and the judgment upon, natural and sinful humanity, which in principle has been annihilated, since the condition of the approach of the new connection with God and of the new life in God is the abrogation of the natural and legal order by God Himself. "Hence this death and this resurrection repeat themselves in every soul, which is called to be gratuitously justified through the condemnation of the legal righteousness, and unto the holiness of a spiritual life through the death unto the flesh and sin."

We now see what Lobstein is aiming at. The resurrection of Christ as experienced in its operating power by Paul, is the foundation of his faith in what may be called Christ's divinity. But since this resurrection (being the *sole* foundation and source of Paul's faith in Christ's divinity) explains His death and since from His death we naturally go back to His life, the divinity of Christ is as it were pushed back gradually until finally we come to a divine preëxistence.

It is, however, a matter of course that these deductions do not belong to the fundamental belief in the deity of Christ. They were the result of Paul's thinking; which was a dangerous occupation for the apostle to engage in: he should have been satisfied with feeling the power of Christ's resurrection without asking questions as to how and whence. By following this path the apostle—he too—would have arrived at the same conclusion as Lobstein that as Christ was human, so we are human, and that as Christ was raised from death so must we likewise be raised. And he would not have arrived at the notion of a personal preëxistence of Christ. For this notion does not belong to the fundamental faith of Paul in Christ's divinity, but is the result not only of metaphysical thinking, but of thinking under the in-

fluence of the theology of the epoch and "clothed in a language borrowed from the theological vocabulary of his time." Accordingly, Lobstein declares it necessary to eliminate a few passages of Scripture which are often quoted as proving that the Pauline Christology is based upon, the metaphysical premises of the personal and eternal preëxistence of the Son of God. "Those texts once being discarded, there will be left a few of which the meaning should not be doubtful," he tells us naively.⁷

It will not be necessary to trace the argument by which Lobstein discards "those texts." The orthodox starting-point is a different one. Hence all we would be able to do would be to give another exegesis, based upon the premise that there is such a thing as an objective truth, and place it over against Lobstein's exegesis, as resulting from a pre-conceived idea, viz., that only experience counts, which means as much or as little experience as we all have in common with the apostle, or rather as the apostle had in common with us. But the ease with which Lobstein discards "those texts" of Paul which might teach a personal pre-existence of Christ as resulting from the influence of his environment, is the more surprising since the author himself states that the relation between Paul and the Jewish schools cannot well be properly defined unless the question be answered first whether the pre-Christian Judaism ascribed to the Messiah a divine and personal preëxistence, which question, Lobstein admits, is far from easily answered. "The uncertainty which hovers over the time and origin of the majority of the documents, *forbids* (italics ours) every categorical assertion in respect to this question."⁸ Then whence such categorically stated conclusions based upon so dubious a fact?

We are, therefore, neither surprised nor convinced when we find as the result of Lobstein's discussion that we may believe in the divinity of Christ without believing in a per-

⁷ P. 35.

⁸ P. 39.

sonal and eternal preëxistence, since with Paul that notion was only a secondary theological corollary which was foreign to his original and essential faith in the deity of Christ.⁹

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apostle John are treated in the same way.

Lobstein admits that the New Testament teaches a pre-existence¹⁰; but the "absolute inspiration of Scripture" is denied. What, then, is left for a foundation under our feet? The sandy bottom of the "religious consciousness" of the early Church, the contents of which are not to be stated at random—oh no!—but are to be determined by the religious consciousness of Lobstein. To maintain this standpoint a distinction has to be made between the foundation of the religious experience and the form of theological argumentation.¹¹ A distinction that cannot well be maintained; for either the experience is false, or the Church which undergoes the experience must be able to trace that divine experience to its proper source. The Christian Church is accused of using a method which is absolutely contrary to the course taken by the early Church: "The thought of the New Testament writers ends in the formula of the preëxistence as in a theological corollary, explicative of the faith of the Church; the traditional dogmatics starts from the formula of the preëxistence, as from a religious axiom, upon which the faith of the Church rests."¹²

But what sort of an explanation of the fact of Christ's preëxistence would that be which would be suitable to certain ages, but not to others, though the fact itself remains? Either the fact, which was a historic fact, or, rather, a pre-historic one, but a *fact* at any rate, has changed with its explanation; or the explanation of the unchangeable fact, that "stubborn thing" remains the same also. If the explanation of their own "faith" is an inadequate one, arrived at through

⁹ Pp. 41, 51.

¹⁰ P. 135.

¹¹ P. 136.

¹² P. 137.

illegitimate philosophizing, it is time for the Ritschlians to rewrite the New Testament. But if this Paul and John could think soundly, it would matter little even if the preëxistent Logos should be their *terminus ad quem*. We are perfectly safe in making this *terminus ad quem* our *terminus a quo*. But moreover Lobstein has not succeeded in making plain that in the Gospel of John and in the Epistle to the Hebrews the preëxistent Logos is the *terminus ad quem*.

Lobstein repeatedly asserts that we can keep our faith in the deity of Christ without maintaining the speculative formula of the preëxistence of the Son of God.¹³ But he can do this only because of the distinction he makes between faith in the fact and the explanation of that faith in the fact, separating them with an impassable gulf. This separation is untenable: we cannot have a fact without the explanation of it. And if we believe in a fact because we experience its power in our hearts we ought to have the courage to explore and to explain that fact, whether that be called metaphysics or "explicative corollary." Nor is there any reason why we should call such an explanation a "metaphysical idol."¹⁴ Accordingly Lobstein has not succeeded in what he calls "dropping the corollary, but keeping the axiom."¹⁵ For his phraseology of the "teleological conception of the eternal and personal *election* (*italics ours*) of the Son of God in regard to the work of salvation"¹⁶ is but the hollow sound of no preëxistence at all.

Lobstein asserts that his view differs from Beyschlag's ideal preëxistence. To us the result seems very much the same; and we fail to see in what respect Lobstein is less negative than Beyschlag. The point of interest, however, is that Lobstein, in giving up the personal and eternal pre-

¹³ Pp. 39, 140, 142.

¹⁴ P. 141.

¹⁵ P. 142.

¹⁶ P. 143. This is in harmony with Jesus' own conception of His Sonship as viewed by Lobstein: "Only the religious consciousness of the particular and eternal election, inspired by the love of the heavenly Father expresses the contents of the filial faith of Jesus" (p. 113).

existence of Christ, as confessed by the early Church, abandons the deity of Christ with it. By robbing the Christian Church of her faith in the personal and eternal pre-existence of Christ he can leave her but this little as her essential faith in Christ's deity—that "she recognizes in Christ the perfect revealer and the organ of the divine love, which forgives and which delivers the unfortunate and culpable sinner." "It is the redemptive work of the Saviour which is at once the testimony, the instrument and the guarantee of eternal grace . . ." from which it follows that all affirmation concerning the deity of Christ separated or isolated from the historic work of the Saviour or the spiritual experience of the Church is illegitimate. And that means that very little deity is left, for after that fashion every Christian minister is a revealer and organ of God's saving grace and consequently at once divine and a teleologically preëxistent divine being, which is not far from pantheism. Indeed, the Ritschlians by substituting Christian feeling for an objective revelation of God, and by reasoning away the preëxistence of Christ as a consequence of this dogma, lead us into very slippery paths.¹⁷

¹⁷ At the end of his treatise, Lobstein asserts that his view is "inspired by the program of Melancthon and is nothing but the development of the thought of Calvin" (p. 150). This is astounding. From Calvin he quotes these words: "A mortal man is conceived of the seed of David; to the merit of what virtues will they ascribe his being made, even in the womb, the Head of angels, the only begotten Son of God, the Image and Glory of the Father, the Light, Righteousness, and Salvation of the world? It is judiciously remarked by Augustine that there is the brightest example of gratuitous election in the Head of the Church himself, that it may not perplex us in the members; that he did not become the Son of God by leading a righteous life, but was gratuitously invested with this high honor, that he might afterwards render others partakers of the gifts bestowed upon him." *Instit.* III, 22, 1. (Transl. of Sixth American Ed. Phila. 1911). This quotation proves nothing, since it has nothing to do with the subject under consideration. The chapter has bearing upon "Eternal Election, or God's Predestination of some to Salvation, and of others to Destruction." These very words, as well as the place where the chapter is inserted, imply that sinners are dealt with (cf. also Dr. Benj. B. Warfield, *The Plan of Salvation*, Phila. 1915, p. 28). Hence Christ does

That the Ritschlians truly lead us into pantheistic waters is still clearer from Dr. Hermann Schultz's *Die Lehre von der Gottheit Christi*,¹⁸ to which Lobstein repeatedly refers with approval. This is perhaps due to the fact that Schultz deals with the subject more exhaustively. According to Schultz the human personality of Christ is the antecedent of his deity.¹⁹ There even is a development in the personality of Jesus and he gradually becomes deified, so that his deity is not complete until he is glorified.²⁰ Consequently this deity must be of such a character that other human beings can possess it also. At which conclusion Schultz logically arrives.²¹ Christ's divinity is not qualitatively distinct from the divinity to which any given man may come, with this exception only, that it is sin which keeps men from reaching

not enter here as one of the elect at all. Reference is only made to Him by way of comparison. Calvin wishes to make clear that the elect are not such because of their superiority over the reprobate. "Let them answer," he says, "why they are men, and not oxen or asses: when it was in God's power to create *them* dogs, he formed them after his own image." This, he goes on, is "their enjoyment of a privilege which they have acquired by no merits." And so it is with election. And then follows Lobstein's quotation. Now look at the word *them* which we underscored. Is it true that God could have made "them" oxen? Strictly speaking, no; for "them" presupposes that they were men. The meaning is: the same "clay" which He has formed "a vessel unto honor," he could have made a "vessel unto dishonor," i.e. the matter of which He made them human beings instead of oxen and asses. The same meaning is to be attached to the reference to Christ. That which in the womb was made just that human being which would be at the same time the Son of God, God could also have made a different child. But that is not saying anything of Him *after* He was made the God-man, nor is anything implied as to the essence of that Son of God who came into this child-nature. The reference, then, has no bearing upon our subject. As to that, Calvin has expounded his views in I, 1, the contents of which are diametrically opposed to Lobstein's view.

¹⁸ *Die Lehre von der Gottheit Christi*. Communicatio Idiomatum, Dargestellt von Dr. Hermann Schultz in Göttingen, Gotha, 1881.

¹⁹ "The human element in Christ is the continual antecedent of his Godhead. And only through the predicate of the Godhead the peculiar character of his humanity is correctly denoted." p. 535.

²⁰ P. 532.

²¹ Chap. xxix: *Der Mensch und Gott*.

this divinity.²² And here is the reason why Christ who was "pious" in the highest degree (*verkörperte Religion*²³), became more of a divine being than we do; but the Christian certainly can arrive at such a deity.²⁴ Yes, Schultz goes so far (the result of the Ritschlian doctrine that all dogma has to be the result of Christian experience) as to assert that *since* the members of the Christian Church do not receive their deity as a "divine substance" which is added to their human personality, but as "creative divine forces and motives, through which their human lives are being lifted above the earthly measure of value," *consequently* we must also conceive of the deity of Christ in such a way that "the human life in him, through the motives and forces of the divine life, is lifted above the world and becomes of a divine value."²⁵ Christ is not even the "originator" of "that spiritual movement" which has grasped "the idea of the *Gottmenschheit*." Rather than upon "the ingenuous (*einfach*) worshipper of the God of Israel the laurel of divinity ought to be placed upon the thinking brow (*Denkerstirn*) of Plato or of the founder of the Stoic School."²⁶ That this is rank pantheism will be clear enough. But perhaps it is not meant to be taken as boldly as it is stated. For when we ask Schultz what that deity is of which Christ and Plato and the Christian Church partake together, the answer is that in general the deity of man is "an act of revelation of God, to which man is religiously open." Man, as a religious being, is able to receive the revelation of God which makes him Divine.²⁷ Hence Christ must be extremely religious in order to become divine. By being so he can receive the divine will and assimilate his own will to it; and so he is the revealer of the divine will, or, he is to us God.²⁸ That for this

²² P. 639.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ P. 640.

²⁵ Pp. 544-547.

²⁶ P. 560.

²⁷ P. 639.

²⁸ Chap. xxix, cf. also p. 611.

Christ must be a religious being is because no man can come to this deity of his own accord (*autonom*), because as a member of the world no one can of his own self judge and will without *weltliche Bestimmtheit*.²⁹ But if Christ does nothing without his Father and abides in Him as the Father does in him, his relation to God is that of the child to his Father. In man in general his deity reveals itself in moral actions.³⁰ In this we either have sheer pantheism, or, if we, Ritschlian-like, may go by our own Christian experience, we might be inclined to say that, even though the Holy Spirit dwells within us and we become partakers of the divine nature (as Schultz reminds us with a reference to 2 Peter 1:4), yet we do not realize that we are deified, and are inclined to say that Christ's deity is not a real deity. But the alternative is a bad one to the Christian heart and mind.

It is not surprising that a man who defends these ideas cannot have much of a belief in the Trinity and in the pre-existence of Christ left. "The deity of Christ" ("Logos" we are simply told in parentheses) "is the revelation of God."³¹ Consistent with it is that Christ as the Son of God is distinguished from God in the same way as is the Church, viz. as a creature, in which God reveals His eternal essence (*zum Ausdrücke bringt*), and that Christ, "fully as much as he knew himself the bearer of the divine revelation over against his people, considered himself a pious member of humankind as over against God."³² This is sufficient reason why this deity cannot be considered personal. Perhaps we would like to inquire what is left of the Trinity. For it would seem as if Schultz, by making the human personality of Christ the precedent of his "divinity," has argued himself out of the possibility of a Trinity. The answer is that there

²⁹ P. 639.

³⁰ P. 641: "It has to realize itself purely and completely in the form of morality. In wisdom and courage it has to reveal itself, as blessedness (*Seligkeit*) and assurance of eternal life, as freedom and holiness to unfold itself."

³¹ P. 607.

³² P. 607.

is a Trinity. But what kind of a Trinity? "The necessity of viewing the one God in a trinitarian way is the result of the certainty that we have to worship this *one* God also in Christ and in the Spirit of his church, and that both reveal themselves as the world-goal (*Weltziel*), and hence as existing in God *before* the world existed."³³ Following the biblical usage of the terms, we call the motives and forces in God His *Spirit*, the revealed will His *Word*. When the motives and forces (*die Motive und Kräfte*) which carry out God's own will are realized in the principle of the church of Christ, we believe that the Church has the Spirit of God in her. When we are sure that the motives and forces meet us creatively out of Christ and his life's work, the eternal will of God has been given us as a revealed will, and Christ influences us persuasively in his life's work, is to us the human bearer of this revealed will, which means the incarnate Word of God."³⁴

"This incarnation of the Word of God," we read, "is to faith a miracle of revelation."³⁵ And miraculous it surely is. That "motives and forces" become flesh (*Fleischwerden des Wortes*) seems even more beyond human comprehension than that a divine Person should assume human nature. In the face of such a solution we would rather hold to the old conception of the Trinity which gives us enough to think about.

In accordance with the above described views, to Schultz, too, only an ideal preëxistence of Christ is possible. The deity of Christ has to be defined (*bestimmt sich*) as the realization (*Verwirklichung*) of the revealed will of God in the revealed will of a creature (*weltliches Wesen*), i.e. as incarnation of the Logos, which is the same as the divine virtues being communicated to the human personality. So Christ as God-man has *ideal* preëxistence in God, because he is the *Weltbedingende Zweckgedanke* of God. The deity which has become man in him, the revealed will of God,

³³ P. 625.

³⁴ P. 611.

³⁵ P. 626.

that is, has *real* præexistence in God, but neither as a special personal being, nor as a supernatural substance,"³⁶ That this is the outcome of the investigation is nothing amazing. Schultz throughout, in speaking of God, emphasizes one-sidedly the unity of God at the expense of His trinity.³⁷ Hence his statements concerning the Trinity and the pre-existence of Christ possess nothing but the form of a belief in the Trinity and the præexistence, denying the substance thereof. That Schultz, like his fellow-Ritschlians, still prefers to be esteemed one who accepts the Christian doctrine is, we suppose, to his credit. But it causes him to state his opinion in words which seem somewhat deceptive. Thus the opening-words of his chapter on the "*Trinitarian basis of the Deity of Christ*" assert that all efforts to belittle the fact which is expressed in the official doctrine of the Trinity must be barred as "doing wrong to the Christian experience of faith." Again he says in chapter xxiv, "thus dogmatic theology has to hold to the consubstantiality of the Godhead of Christ with that of the *one* true God." "The consubstantiality (*Homusie*) which the church has gained in the struggle against the false conception of the Arian Christology should not be given up at any cost."³⁸ Such statements sound well—at a distance. But the consubstantiality of the Church is not the *Wesensgleichheit* of the *Godhead of Christ* with *that of* the one true God; but the consubstantiality *of Christ* with the one true God. According to Schultz's statement Christ may be a mere man notwithstanding his confessed sameness of essence with God for he is only a channel through which the Father's deity flows, or an instrument of which God's essence takes

³⁶ P. 626.

³⁷ "Thus dogmatic theology has to hold to the consubstantiality of the Godhead of Christ with that of the *one* true God" (p. 541). "For a divine Personality can never be conceived of as pious over against the *one* God, not even for this reason that he carries with him human nature" (p. 542). "Christ must not be honored as God *besides* (*neben*) God, but only in God and *from* (*aus*) God, as *God's revelation* for us" p. 562, etc.

³⁸ P. 541.

hold in order to make use of it. And as such he works out his specious opening phraseology. The Ritschlians find it hard to serve two masters. The fundamental fault is that the human personality is taken as the basis of the entire study of Christ.

And here we might add that Schultz's assertion that Christ must be a human personality in order to be divine, since "a divine person could never be conceived of as pious over against the one God, not even because he has a human nature," for "piousness is not the relation of a nature, but of a person," does not only err in that the oneness of God is confessed at the expense of the Trinity (as said above), but also in as much as the human nature is conceived of as an *abstractum* and not as body *and* soul. If the latter were done, as is the case in the official doctrine of the two natures, there would be no reason why Christ could not be the "subject of religion."

(TO BE CONCLUDED)

Hammond, Ind.

JAN KAREL VANBAALEN.

REVIEWS OF RECENT LITERATURE

APOLOGETICAL THEOLOGY

Can the Church Survive in the Changing Order? By ALBERT PARKER FITCH, Professor of the History of Religion in Amherst College. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1920. 8vo. Pp. 79.

In the judgment of Professor Fitch she can on two conditions. These are, first, that she give up her belief in the Bible as a supernatural, and consequently, infallible revelation, and, second, that she substitute in her faith naturalistic evolution for supernatural creation. These conditions can probably be advantageously resolved into one; viz., the repudiation of the Supernatural, and this can best be interpreted as meaning at last that there is no essential distinction between Christ and men. Indeed, "we differ from the Lord Jesus in immeasurable degree, but not in kind" (p. 65). Let the church thus deny her God and Savior, let her thus conform to the naturalistic spirit of the age; and she will survive the mutations of the ages. Otherwise, she will and must drop out as outside of the trend of evolution.

Two remarks would seem called for:

1. If the church were so to deny her Lord and Savior, what would survive would not be the church. What constitutes the church such is her confession of Christ as her God and Lord; and by God and Lord she means that unique person who, though he has taken into union with himself man's nature, is, nevertheless, in his person "infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth." It is her witness to this great fact that makes her the "church of the living God." Let her cease this testimony, and she has become merely another human association.

2. The church will not forget permanently her message and mission. We venture to say this, not because, like Prof. Fitch, we assume the role of a prophet; but because this is affirmed (Matt. xvi. 18) by him who is the greatest of the prophets, to whom all the prophets bare witness, who is himself the word and the truth of God. To doubt him would be to make thought untrustworthy and being an illusion.

Our author writes frankly and clearly, sometimes brilliantly. It is impossible to read him and not see what the new theology is—utterly unscriptural, indeed, so "plastic" as to be what any age would like it to be. Herein will lie the usefulness of this book. It unmask our foe.

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

Divine Overruling. By W. SANDAY, D.D., F.B.A. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1920. 8vo. Pp. viii, 104.

This book contains Dr. Sanday's last public utterances as Lady Margaret Professor. When convinced that the time had come for him to retire, he planned 'a short course of lectures which might, perhaps, be suitable to mark the close of the tenure of the chair as an inaugural marks its beginning.' Called upon then to preach before the University in the regular course, he "ventured to print this sermon along with the lectures." Though the four chapters thus formed "were not exactly designed in the first instance as a continuous series," yet, "apart from the fact that they were all written at the same time, there is a real connection between them." 'This is expressed in the common title under which they are grouped.' "The underlying thought is that not only the field of what we call special revelation but the whole process of religious evolution must be included in one great divine scheme, which has its human side of progressive experiment, but has no less its divine side in which all the scattered imperfect and fluctuating efforts of man are coordinated into a single continuous and comprehensive whole, with subtle invisible links between its various parts and stages."

This general position is illustrated and maintained, first, from "The Place of Comparative Religion in Theological Study." When this place is what it should be, each religion, however inferior, is found to have contributed to the knowledge of what God has willed in the sense of permitted, if not to what he has commanded. This idea is further developed in the second chapter, which is on "Natural and Revealed Religion." In this chapter we are shown—and especially by citations from Egyptian and Babylonian writings—that we should think of God as the great organist of the universe; and that if we do not so regard him, then all the difference that there would be between natural and revealed religion would "correspond to slightly less or slightly more sustained pressure upon the keys." That is, the difference would be one of degree only; it would not be one of kind. "The third lecture develops the point that it is a mistake to suppose that this divine element involves anything that is really arbitrary or irregular." "The sermon may be taken to illustrate an application of the general idea in its bearing upon modern problems."

To the main proposition thus confirmed and illustrated there can be no objection, at least on the part of the theist. God hath "fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass"; and, either efficiently or permissively, he "doeth according to his will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth." Nor can this great fact and truth of the universality of Providence be emphasized too strongly. The natural world must be conceived unnaturally, unless it be regarded as manifesting throughout the presence, power, wisdom, and goodness of the Supernatural. This, however, is not to say that the natural and the Supernatural are in essence identical, nor that God reveals himself only through the natural, nor even that all the natural

really reveals God. The world-religions do not, as Dr. Sanday would seem to teach, serve as an introduction to the higher and purer revelation in Christianity; rather do they indicate the extremes to which sinners have gone in their revolt against God. They show that man has a religious nature which he cannot destroy: they obscure, they do not disclose, the true object of religion. They can serve as an introduction to Christianity only by bringing out the awful contrast between them and it.

So, too, Dr. Sanday errs when he would do away with Bishop Butler's distinction between "natural and revealed religion." This distinction is as real as it is essential. Our author's citations from Egyptian and Babylonian scriptures, striking, interesting, beautiful, though they are, are not to the point. It would be easy to get together as many or more, notably from the religion of India, that were shockingly the reverse of these in character. No less an authority than Max Müller has told us that the Vedas will not be read by Occidentals unless they are expurgated. Why is it that this revolting element cannot be found in the "revealed" scripture of God? Does not the unique purity of these indicate the distinctness of their source? They are free from the puerilities, and especially from the abominations of the world-religions, because they were written by "holy men of God who spake," not out of their own divinely created and sustained and directed religious nature even, but, "as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Because "revealed religion presupposes man's religious nature, it would be strange, indeed, if many of the teachings of the latter were not the same with those of the former. But this would not prove or indicate their unity. A glorious temple may be built upon the rock and so in many respects it may be like the rock. That will not make it identical with it: a new element has come in, even the intellect and skill of the architect; the temple is the *immediate* revelation of his personality.

It is, however, in the chapter on "The Nature of Miracle" that Dr. Sanday discloses his position most clearly. To put it briefly, he repudiates the miraculous and in so far forth the Supernatural. He says (p. 66) "I would ask you to consider whether it is not possible to keep the idea of miracle but to eliminate from it the element of 'the abnormal.' I fully believe that there were miracles in the age of the Gospel and Acts, in the sense of 'wonderful' and 'mighty works' but I do not think that they involve any real break in the order of nature." That is to say, there are miracles: but they are not miraculous; they are only providences that look as if they were particular; they do not involve any special and personal supernatural intervention; they can all be explained on the basis of the natural.

That this is our author's meaning appears in two ways: First, in his definition of "the abnormal." "You may ask me how I would define the abnormal," he writes. "I should be glad," he continues, "if I could rather shift the responsibility for defining it from myself and say that I meant by the abnormal that which would be taken as

such or under ordinary circumstances be disallowed by, or would cause serious difficulty to, an open-minded, well-instructed man of science. It is really the scientific spirit that I wish to represent." Second, in the "explanation" which he proposes of specimen miracles. For example, the story of the floating axe-head in 2 Kings v. 1-7. What he desires to "explain," i.e., to explain away here, is just the floating of the axe-head; and the reason why he wishes to get rid of it is just that it is naturally impossible. Hence, while he admits the fact, he tries to account for it on natural grounds; viz, that the salt water of the Dead Sea is so dense that eggs will float on it. Eggs, however, are not axe-heads; and the Jordan, on the water of which the axe-head floated, is not the Dead Sea.

With the explanation we are not so much concerned, however, as with the conviction, the motive, back of it. It reveals the fact that Dr. Sanday has no further use for the Supernatural. He does not teach that nature is God, but he does teach that God confines himself to nature. Indeed, he accepts the awful consequences of this position. He rejects the virgin birth of our Lord and his literal bodily resurrection and his physical ascension (pp. 74 and 75).

While we are forced to make these strictures, we are glad to call attention to the excellence of the volume in other respects. It is marked by Dr. Sanday's well known simplicity and clearness of style, by rare caution, by ample knowledge, and by sweetness of spirit peculiar to himself; and to say this is to say much.

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY

Christianity according to St. Luke. By the REV. S. C. CARPENTER, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of Selwyn College, Cambridge, Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Southwell. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1919. Pp. xii, 239.

Mr. Carpenter does not present any very distinctive account of the Lucan writings, but is inclined to regard with sympathy the observations of modern scholars of widely divergent tendencies. With regard to some things indeed—as, for example, the Lucan authorship of Luke-Acts—his mind is made up; but with regard to the exact degree of trustworthiness to be attributed to the New Testament narratives he is often in doubt. For example, at one point (p. 77) he is able to regard without sharp disfavor a rationalizing explanation of the feeding of the five thousand, which would regard "the real purpose of the distribution" as "what we would call 'religion,'" and would represent the event as "more like the Holy Communion than a regular meal" and "the portions distributed" as "very small"! Yet he accepts the fact of the Virgin Birth, though on doctrinal

rather than historical grounds—because of its congruence with the doctrine of the incarnation. In this connection (pp. 160, 161), Mr. Carpenter quotes with approval a passage of DuBose, which insists that Jesus Christ was not an “individual human person”—as He would have been if He had been son of Joseph and Mary—and that “it was not one man but humanity that He was.” Here our author involves himself in a dangerous and erroneous form of speculation. Compare p. 218.

The “churchmanship” of Mr. Carpenter at times assumes a form distasteful to Protestant ears, not only in details like the incidental use of the phrase “Our Lady” as referring to the mother of the Lord, but also in the depreciation of the authority of Scripture in the supposed interests of the Church. Thus, in opposition to “the attempt to produce conversions to Christianity by distributing copies of the Bible, even of the Gospels,” Mr. Carpenter gives the following account of the “Apostolic procedure,” as the procedure which ought still to be followed now (pp. 9, 10). “The baptized child receives, as formerly the adult inquirer received, some elementary Christian teaching about God and Christ and being good. This is given either by the priest at the Little Catechism, or by the teacher in the Sunday Kindergarten, or by the mother at home. Sometimes by all three. But in any case by the Church. As soon as he knows some prayers, and a hymn or two like ‘I love to hear the story’ he is taken to the Church, and is introduced to Christian worship. ‘Who is that?’ ‘The priest.’ ‘What is he doing?’ ‘He is standing at the altar, and doing what our Lord says we are to do.’ Then, presently, comes the reading of the Gospels. That is the true Christian order of events.”

But we are glad to find in Mr. Carpenter’s book, despite his “churchmanship” some good observations (p. 206) about the danger of tending “to substitute the Church for Christ,” and of following Professor Murray in resolving Christianity into “membership of a community.” Our agreement extends also to what Mr. Carpenter says in opposition to the current desire of believing “more than one religion at the same time” (p. 223), and in opposition to the “flamboyant ‘patriotism,’ to which, for emphasis, the name of God has been attached” (p. 224).

Princeton.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.

The Rival Philosophies of Jesus and of Paul. Being an Explanation of the Failures of Organized Christianity and a Vindication of the Teachings of Jesus, which are shown to contain a Religion for All Men and for All Time. By IGNATIUS SINGER, Author of “Some Unrecognized Laws of Nature,” “Problems of ‘Life,’” etc. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd. Ruskin House, 40 Museum Street, W.C. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1919.

Mr. Singer is totally ignorant of the subjects which he undertakes to treat, but at the same time convinced of the total ignorance of all

his predecessors. The result is a somewhat curious, but not very instructive book. The author is convinced that "the philosophy of Jesus" is all that it should be, and that "the philosophy of Paul" and of the Church is all that is evil, but his lordly disregard of all the data for the solution of the historical problems, and his utter neglect of what other minds have contributed even in support of his own thesis, prevent his revolutionary book from being very interesting.

Why does such a writer continue to reverence Jesus of Nazareth? In that question lies perhaps the sole interest of the book. In his exposition of "the philosophy of Jesus," Mr. Singer soon abandons his abortive attempts at literary and historical criticism, and proceeds to develop his own "philosophy" entirely unchecked by history of any kind. Yet the name of Jesus, at any rate, if not His real Person, is still revered.

Princeton.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.

HISTORICAL THEOLOGY

American Lutheranism. Volume I. Early History of American Lutheranism and The Tennessee Synod. By F. BENTE. Concordia Series of Modern Literature Theological and Religious. St. Louis, Mo., Concordia Publishing House. 1919. Cloth 5 x 7½. Pp. X, 237. Price, \$1.25, postpaid.

Though the first of a four-volume work on "American Lutheranism," this first volume was preceded by Vol. II, which appeared last June (1919), and dealt with the "Merger Synod" of 1918. Vol. III will take up the history of the Synods of Ohio, Iowa, Buffalo, and Scandinavia. Vol. IV will be a history of the doctrinal positions of the Missouri, Wisconsin, and other Synods. Following the introduction in this first volume, there is given the history of the Lutheran Church in Delaware, Georgia, New York, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, Maryland, and Virginia (pp. 11-147). The second section (pp. 148-237) is devoted to the history of the Tennessee Synod.

Professor Bente's history is written from the level of high and exclusive Lutheranism. As they say in Erlangen: "Er ist echt lutherisch." Never can the reader lose sight of the fact that the author of this book is a high Lutheran of the strictest and most primitive type. At the very outset this is made clear. Christianity is the only true religion. The Church is the totality of those in whom faith is found. In its Lutheran expression it is not the only saving church. But,—*"The Lutheran Church is the Church of the pure Word and the unadulterated Sacraments. It is the only Church proclaiming the alone-saving truth of the Gospel in its purity"* (p. 5).

In the Preface (p. v). Lutheranism is said to be, not Christianity *plus* Luther's ideas and modifications, but "simply Christianity, consistent Christianity, neither more nor less." Hence the Lutheran Church is "the only denomination qualified to head a true unity-union movement, because she alone is in full possession of those unadulterated truths without which there can be neither true Christian unity nor God-pleasing Christian union" (p. 9). This is the plane on which the whole treatment proceeds, and is the dogmatic presupposition of this history. Judged by it, American Lutheranism has not been very Lutheran. Indeed, one might almost say that it has been almost everything else but Lutheran. This high Lutheranism even excludes fraternization with Reformed bodies, such fraternization, as in the case of Muhlenberg, "was of a nature incompatible with true Lutheranism" (p. 84). The Pietistic movement in the Lutheran Church is condemned (pp. 74-77). The slogan of the American Lutheran Church must never be: "Back to Muhlenberg! Back to Halle!" but "Back to Wittenberg! Back to Luther!" "Back to the unadulterated Lutheranism of Luther and the Lutheran Symbols" (pp. 91, 155, 174)—the *Confessio Augustana Invariata*. This "true Lutheranism" is only another name for "consistent Christianity" (p. 99), so that the various Reformed bodies are just "sects."

When it is asked how deep a hold this specific type of Lutheranism actually took in America, the answer of this book points mainly to one synod,—Tennessee; and one family,—the Henkels. And even the Tennessee Synod weakened, and joined the Lutheran Merger in 1918.

In order to form a safe value-judgment on this aspect of Professor Bente's first volume, a thoroughly dispassionate approach is needed. For one thing, we appreciate his attachment to what he regards as consistent and essential Lutheranism. Professor Bente does not see how Lutheranism can develop or undergo change and still be Lutheran. That is his complaint. The various Lutheran bodies *think* they are Lutheran, but when, tried by the accepted Lutheran standards, that is precisely what they are not. The question with Professor Bente is: How much of primitive, sixteenth century Lutheranism must one believe to be a genuine Lutheran? Whereas with his opponents it seems to be: How much of this sixteenth century Lutheranism can a modern Lutheran get along without? How little of it can he accept, and still remain essentially a Lutheran?

There will be Lutherans who will resent this rigid definition of the essential content of Lutheranism, given it by Professor Bente and for so long maintained by the Tennessee Synod. To them it will appear unwarranted; and, to borrow a popular, over-labored word of our day, somewhat "narrow." To decide this, would involve a thorough study of confessional and historical Lutheranism. It all depends on what essential Lutheranism is, and whether modern Lutheranism, to be Lutheran, must be the Lutheranism of Luther and of the unaltered

Augustana. Professor Bente's standpoint is quite understandable in the light of the modern unionist movement, in which real differences are either denied or ignored as vital, under the present stress of the Ritschlian theology and the Pragmatic philosophy. This is no imagined pitfall. We must be true to truth. The peril of so-called organic union is that it may not be organic. Even federated unions of denominations of decidedly differing anthropology and soteriology may be a more unsafe politic than many enthusiasts to-day ever dream of. It is a hasty age, easily blinded to the day of philosophic accountability which is sure to come.

So far, we thoroughly appreciate Professor Bente's historical lament. But there is another side. Is this high Lutheranism true to the teaching of Scripture? Is it rationally defensible? That is a question for the dogmatic theologian. As a Lutheran historian, Professor Bente takes this for granted. Assuredly, the great Reformed theologians of the sixteenth and subsequent centuries have to be reckoned with. Laying this aside, however, does the purity of this type of Lutheranism depend on its persistent opposition to fraternalism with the other evangelical "sects"? Where in Scripture does Professor Bente find adequate justification for the "high-browed" exclusiveness of the Tennessee Synod? By what kind of argument can it be shown that any sort of fraternization with an evangelical church whose creed differs from that of our own is necessarily either a succumbing to that creed or an approval of it on our part? We may be friendly, even though we differ. A dignified difference is often a part of the highest brotherhood. It is admitted that there is a cheap, patronizing fraternalism that throws away essential truth. But it surely does not follow that inter-denominational friendliness is incompatible with honest and accurate theological diversity, so long as that diversity does not deny the truths of fundamental Christianity. It is such spiritual aloofness that so easily runs off into religious bigotry.

There are three kinds of ecclesiastical proximity: organic union, federation, and fraternization. The first two demand radical changes and, in the interest of common veracity, must ultimately affect essential convictions. The last is largely a matter of practical conference, worship, and mutual edification. No one church has such a monopoly of Christian truth that it cannot receive more light from another. But the Tennessee Synod made strict doctrinal unity the *sine qua non* of all church fellowship (p. 214). With this attitude Professor Bente is in cordial sympathy. In fact, religious unbelief and rationalism which crept into the Lutheran Church was due, not to the language question, always a vital one in American Lutheranism, but to the indifferentism and unionism of some of the synods (p. 101; cf. 143, 150). And for this, Muhlenberg, who was over-friendly with Episcopalians and other Reformed churches, was partly to blame (pp. 36, 136; cf. pp. 84-91). Muhlenberg's Lutheranism was accordingly not genuine, but a pietistic Lutheranism (p. 73).

Hillsboro, Ohio.

BENJAMIN F. PAIST, JR.

SYSTEMATICAL THEOLOGY

Broad Church Theology. Its Limitations and Defects. By W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D. London: Robert Scott, Roxburghe House. United States of America: The Morehouse Publishing Co., Milwaukee, Wis. 1919. Pp. 130.

This is one of a series of small volumes entitled: *Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice*, of which series the author of the present volume is the editor. If all the volumes of the series are as vigorously written and with as much sound sense as this one, they should prove a useful addition to popular theological literature.

The title of this volume does not precisely indicate its contents. It is true that it is a polemic against Broad Church Theology, especially in regard to its views of God and Christ. Nevertheless this book might perhaps be more accurately entitled *The Theology of Modern Liberal Protestantism*. This would probably be a better title for this book simply because, as the author points out, Broad Church Theology is practically one with modern Liberalism in general, and also because Dr. Simpson in his polemic does not confine himself at all to the writings of Broad Churchmen, but seems rather to select more or less at random examples of modern liberal theology.

M. Reville has truly said that "Liberal Protestantism" is distinguished by its opposition to the idea of authority. It is for this reason that its doctrines vary with different individual theological thinkers, just as in the case of the old "Mediating Theology." Consequently, as Dr. Simpson says, it is not easy to determine with precision what the doctrines of the Broad Church School are. While, however, there are varying views in the positive statement of doctrines, there is substantial agreement in its denials or in what it opposes. And what it opposes, as Dr. Simpson shows with admirable directness, is just the historic Christian Faith as conceived by the entire evangelical Christian Church.

It is the Unitarianism of the Broad Church Theology in its conception of the personality of God, and its Humanitarianism in its conception of the Person of Christ to which Dr. Simpson chiefly limits his discussion. In criticising these theological doctrines of Liberalism, Dr. Simpson does not stop with exposing their want of harmony with the Scripture and historic Christianity, and their inherent difficulties and inconsistencies. He goes on to show that the questions involved are not merely ones of abstract metaphysical speculation, but that the differences between a truly Divine Christ and a purely human Jesus, and between an essential Trinity and one of mere manifestation, are differences which involve two absolutely different kinds of religion and religious life, feeling, and conduct.

In this we believe that Dr. Simpson is absolutely right, and that he has done a service in emphasizing this at the present time when the Church is afflicted with doctrinal indifferentism.

Princeton.

C. W. HODGE.

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

Commentary on the Epistle of Paul to the Romans. BY EDWARD INCREASE BOSWORTH, D.D., Senior Dean of the Faculty and Morgan Professor of the New Testament Language and Literature, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology. New York: the Macmillan Co. Cloth. 12 mo. Pp. 281. Price \$1.10.

This volume, in the series edited by Shailer Matthews, D.D., under the title "The Bible for Home and School," will be of special interest to those who believe that the future visible return of Christ is to introduce a new age of glory upon the earth. The author declares that the purpose of the letter bears directly upon that doctrine. "Paul intended Romans to be a document that should hasten the end of the present age. It was to be a unification platform on which all who were to be saved from 'the wrath' in the Messianic judgment must quickly take their stand and so produce a situation that would draw the Lord from heaven to introduce the New Age. In order to recognize the justification for this statement it is necessary to see as clearly as possible the world situation as it appeared to Paul."

"At the time of writing Romans Paul was possessed, as he had been for years, by a single passionate desire. It was to see the world in such a condition that the one whom he had learned to call the Lord Jesus Christ would come down from the heavenly spirit world, end this present evil, death-smitten flesh age and by a resurrection of the dead begin the New Spirit Age. This consummation seemed to him not far distant." (Page 36.)

He further adds "Just at this critical juncture in the process of securing such a situation on the earth as would lead God to send his Son from heaven, he prepared with great care a document calculated to contribute largely to this end. He prepared a platform on which, as it seemed to him, all Christians must come together, and afterward be joined by the great mass of the Jewish nation in readiness for the New Age." (Page 41.)

It is true that the author intimates that this expectation of a coming age was a mistaken presupposition on the part of Paul and one which has "disappeared from modern thought," and has given place to the conception of "a universe in process of evolution, guaranteeing to men an eternal career not simply as individuals but as a race." Throughout the Commentary the statements of Paul are interpreted with great fairness, as the author endeavors to substantiate his statement as to the belief of Paul in the coming age which is to follow the return of Christ. For example, he comments on Chapter 13:12 as follows: "*The night is far spent*": "This age and this world are darkness under the control of the world rulers of this darkness. The coming age will begin when the Lord with light from the heavens above breaks victoriously in upon this darkness. This time is now close at hand." Of course the conflict between the definite statements of the Apostle and the more reliable (?) deliverances of "mod-

ern thought" limits for the author the value of the Epistle and awakens in the mind of the reader a question as to what has become of the inspiration and authority of Scripture. A no less serious question is awakened by the references both in the Introduction and in the comments upon the text to "the death of Christ," or "the blood of Christ." Here nothing sacrificial or vicarious or expiatory seems to be indicated, though it is clearly stated that the sufferings of Christ were an exhibition of the love of God and the moral results for believers are clearly stated. In this and in other particulars the author is apparently endeavoring to find in the Epistle teachings which may be helpful to those who have ceased to believe in the fundamental truths held by St. Paul.

The analysis of the Epistle is clear, the comments are necessarily brief, the paraphrase of the text is carefully written; but it will seem to many that a "*Bible for Home and School*" would be more helpful if it did not suggest so continually that the teachings of Paul need to be corrected by the "presuppositions" of modern scholars.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

The Prophetical Literature of the Old Testament. By ALEXANDER GORDON, D.Litt., D.D., Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, Presbyterian College, Montreal. Edinburgh. T. & T. Clark. Paper. 16 mo. Pp. 121.

This "Primer" is intended as a text book for teachers and Senior Bible Class students. It assumes as absolutely unquestioned the results of modern radical criticism. It affirms dogmatically that there were three Isaiahs and two Zechariahs. In speaking of Isaiah 40 to 55 it is stated that these chapters "are now universally assigned to an unknown prophet writing towards the close of the exile." Chapters 56 to 66 are assigned to a third writer of a later date. The "Succering Servant" of Isaiah 53 is identified with the Jewish nation. The Book of Daniel is of course assigned to an unknown writer in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, and "the stone" cut out of the mountain by unseen hands is likewise declared to be Israel. And "the one like unto a son of man" is identified with "the people of the saints of the most high" and described as being "the true community of Israel." The Book of Jonah is declared to be "an early example of moral apologue or parable." Its date is placed at about 250 B.C. The characteristic feature of the discussion is its failure to suggest the divine inspiration of the prophets and its practical denial of the reality of predictive prophecy.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

The Gospel and the Epistles of St. John. By JAMES ALEXANDER ROBERTSON, M.A. Edinburgh. T. & T. Clark. Paper. 16 mo. Pp. 129.

This brief and rather abstruse treatise forms a part of the series of "Primers for Teachers and Senior Bible Class Students" edited

by the Rev. George Henderson, D.D. The author declares his purpose is to furnish "some helpful fingerposts and viewpoints along the spiritual pathway which the Gospel and Epistles of St. John have sought with such marvelous simplicity, depth and vision, to unfold."

Excepting for its brevity the discussion has few features which are characteristic of a primer. The treatment is not remarkable for its clearness and it is at times difficult to discover the meaning of the author. He states very definitely, however, that both the Gospel and the Epistles are written by St. John, "the beloved disciple." In rather a minute outline he exhibits the Gospel as a drama in which light and darkness are in conflict. The next chapter embodies the "portrait of Christ" as drawn by St. John. It dwells more upon the features of manhood than upon the divine person whom John designed to reveal. According to this author "the truth is that John is more anxious to establish the humanity of Christ than the first three Gospels are." After dwelling upon the "sinlessness" and "searching insight" of Christ, he emphasizes his "serenity" and "sincerity," and closes with these words "gazing on him we become assured at length that our human nature is represented in the Deity and man with God is on the throne." In dealing with "the place of the cross in John's thought," he declares "the cross is the collision of light and darkness." "It is a disclosure of the divine conscience which judges in the center of humanity"; and further, "the communication of Eternal Life to men is the conception which stands for the atonement, in the Fourth Gospel." Most remarkable of all, in this connection, is the treatment of "the allegory of the vine" as setting forth the atoning work of our Lord. Even less satisfactory is the chapter which deals with "The Spirit and the Ever-living Christ." Here the author declares "Holy Spirit is a power or force, which has its source in God, the essence of which is communication, and the effect of which is to make for holiness in the lives of men"; and again "the Spirit of God is the divine self-consciousness. The Spirit of God which was imparted without measure to Christ is thus the God-consciousness of Jesus, that unique and awesome experience which was constantly his all through his ministry, the sense of the very presence of God." It requires some presumption to claim that one fully understands such statements, but candor necessitates dissent from their apparent implications.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

The Church We Forget. By PHILIP WHITEWELL WILSON. Author of "The Christ We Forget." The Fleming H. Revell Company. Cloth Binding, \$2.00 net.

This volume is properly a sequel to Mr. Wilson's first book. It promises to have a similar success, for with all the virtues of the former publication it is lacking in some errors of interpretation that subjected the first book to unfavorable judgment on the part of critical scholars.

The author is a layman. An Englishman by birth and university training, he has lived in this country for several years past where he

has built up a well-deserved reputation as American correspondent of the London News. He ranks high as a student and interpreter of social and economic problems which pertain to American genius, traditions and institutions. Somewhat abruptly he now emerges as an earnest thinker, of evidently wide reading and respectable scholarship, in the sphere of religion. Although a Cambridge graduate he does not seem to be an English Churchman, but rather a mystic whose affinities would find their normal development in the Society of Friends. This makes it unnecessary to add that *The Church We Forget* is devout from beginning to end. It is written in the reverent spirit which one sometimes misses in the student of New Testament introduction and interpretation. What is more, the book is thoroughly evangelical. The writer holds a high doctrine of inspiration, and the supreme Deity of our Lord is again and again affirmed without equivocation or evasion. For example, on page 39, we read: "In both of them" (Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians) "the opening verse couples together 'God the Father' with 'Our Lord Jesus Christ.' To the Galatians, also, Paul wrote of 'Jesus Christ and God the Father,' thus actually giving precedence on this occasion to the Son; while to Timothy, the ascription was, 'God Our Savior and Lord Jesus Christ.'" And again, "So absolutely did these, His followers, believe that all power had been given to Him, in heaven and earth; so fully did they accept his word for that, that they preached not only Christ the Redeemer, but Christ the Creator and Upholder of the Universe. He is before all things and by Him all things consist." The same high doctrine is maintained respecting miracles in the remarkable chapter on "The Miracles of Healing," and throughout the entire book there is not only the implication, but the explicit, oft-repeated affirmation that the Holy Spirit endowed the apostles with supernatural wisdom in laying the foundations of Christian doctrine and in developing the Church as a supernatural institution. And the significant thing is that the writer becomes thus dogmatic (though he would likely repudiate the adjective) not because he has any familiarity with books on theology, but only by reason of the fact that he has been a devout and thoughtful student of the New Testament itself. The refreshing sanity and reasonableness of the author is noteworthy in these days so abounding in vagaries. Spiritualism, page 61; Socialism, pp. 239, 284, 295, 311; the Second Coming, pp. 249-250; Womanhood, (see chapter, "Rescue of Womanhood"); "Religion in the University"—all these subjects are dealt with in a spirit at once candid and sensible.

The distinct purpose of the book is to call the nineteenth century church to a reconsideration of the church of the first century, its doctrines, methods, programme, and the secret of its resistless power. Nothing could be more timely. How far can the church of Christ to-day bear this acid test? A book like this will do much good, the more because it is written from the layman's standpoint, and presents a graphic and faithful picture of times and events in which every Christian must have a vital interest. The fascination of the volume

is indeed irresistible, and the thoughtful reader who opens the book at the first chapter will surrender himself as a captive until the last page is turned.

Princeton.

SYLVESTER WOODBRIDGE BEACH.

In the Redeemer's Footsteps. Sermons on the Gospel Lessons for the Church Year. By LEANDER S. KEYSER, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Hamma Divinity School, Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio. Burlington, Iowa, The Lutheran Literary Board. Cloth. Full octavo. Pp. 271. Price \$2.00.

The first volume of this series contains sermons intended for the Sundays of the Lutheran Church Year, covering the period from Advent to Whit Sunday. The present volume covers all the Trinity Sundays, twenty-eight in number, with added sermons on Harvest Home, Thanksgiving Day, Memory of the Dead, The Reformation and Luther's Birthday. These sermons are without exception brief in form, simple and clear in statement, and evangelical in their teaching.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

The Individualistic Gospel and other Essays. By ANDREW GILLIES. Methodist Book Concern. 1919. Pp. 208. \$1 net.

The author holds fast to Evangelical Christianity against all substitutes, old or new, and sets forth the fundamental principles of the faith with judgment, clearness, and power. Particularly happy is his treatment of the dogma so widely preached in our time that the appeal of the Gospel is primarily not individual but social, and that to be greatly concerned about our own salvation is selfish and unchristian. Jonathan Edwards and John Wesley are taken as exponents of "the individualistic Gospel" and it is shown how the great New England preacher, who said, "I make seeking my salvation the main business of my life," exhibited the most unselfish character and accomplished the most far-reaching results of any man of his generation. While Wesley, who affirmed, "My chief motive is the saving of my own soul," and defined the church as "a body of men compacted together in order first to save each his own soul," was the greatest power for righteousness that the world has known since the days of Luther. The position is firmly maintained that the reconstruction of society upon a Christian basis must come through the regeneration of the individual.

Wise words are spoken regarding the present danger of emphasizing the life that now is, and ignoring the life to come with its eternal recompense or retribution. Yet surely it is going too far to affirm that "the pulpits of the Methodist Episcopal Church are silent on these solemn themes, and so are the pulpits of all Methodism and of all the other Evangelical churches" (p. 37). But it is true that "every great Christian age and every vital spiritual revival in Christian history has had at its heart the belief in and emphasis of the judgment and eternal consequences of continued sin, and, conversely, the periods marked by

moral and spiritual decadence have been periods when the pulpit has been silent about, and the people have ceased to believe vitally in, the fact that 'because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience'" (pp. 44, 45).

The truth is that in his eagerness to save men God leaves no avenue of entrance to the soul untried, appeals to every motive. He may awaken men even through their selfish fears and because the preacher deals with men of every kind he must speak to every man in his own tongue. It is highly unreasonable to insist that in addressing men sunk in selfishness and sin he shall press upon them only those lofty motives and altruistic impulses which operate in the breast of the mature believer. It may be that dread of death and the judgment will turn their thoughts toward God more effectually than any other truth that could be brought to bear upon them. It may be a low motive, but then a low motive may appeal most powerfully to a low nature.

Princeton.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Why We Fail as Christians. By ROBERT HUNTER, author of "Poverty, Violence and the Labor Movement," "Socialists at Work," "Labor in Politics," etc. Macmillan Co. 1919. Pp. xii, 180. Price \$1.60.

This book is a study of the second great commandment of the law, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, with constant illustration drawn from the Life of Count Leo Tolstoy. The thought that dominates the treatment of the theme is that the great obstacle to Christianity in every age since the days of the apostles is the possession of private property. The remedy is communism, which appears to be synonymous with Socialism (pp. 168-170). The words of Jesus to the rich young ruler are cited (p. 89), "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the Kingdom of God!" (Mark x. 23); but his explanation of the words is omitted—"How hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the Kingdom of God!" (Mark x. 24). Apparently it is taught that men are rewarded or punished in the life to come simply because they were poor or rich in this life. "There is nothing in the parable to indicate that Jesus found anything wrong in Dives beyond the fact that he possessed riches, while his brother was sick, and dying of hunger. Nothing is said of the vices or sins of the rich man, nor is anything said of the virtue or faith of the poor man. Yet the one is condemned to everlasting punishment, while the other is taken into the very bosom of Abraham" (p. 90). It did not occur to the author to inquire how Abraham could find a place in the Kingdom from which the rich are excluded, for Abraham was very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold" (Gen. xiii. 9, xxiv. 35).

The endeavor to show that Paul was a communist is futile (p. 124). The sin of Ananias consisted not in giving a part of what he had while the law of the church required that he should give the whole (p. 122), but in lying about the matter as the narrative plainly declares. Community of goods, so far as the Scripture indicates, prevailed only in Jerusalem, and was not a matter of compulsion or of

fixed order, but wholly voluntary. There is no record of any attempt on the part of the apostles to establish it elsewhere. Private property is presupposed in the injunctions to give alms, and to lay by in store on the first day of the week (I Cor. xvi. 2); and these are duties of universal and permanent obligation. A number of the parables of Jesus plainly teach the right of private property, and affirm that men are held responsible for the use they make of it.

The account given of the life and belief of Tolstoy, with whom the author was personally acquainted, is interesting. His errors and defects are as clearly shown as his virtues. He represented individualism carried to its last extremity. "If one were to name his philosophy, it would have to be called Christian anarchism" (p. 74). He would ally himself with no party, take part in no organized effort for political or social reform (pp. 74-75). "He denounced science and all the products of the mechanical era" (p. 76). The command that all men must labor he applied only to manual toil (p. 26). "He felt so keenly the opposition of his wife and children that he was led to believe what he said repeatedly—that the institution of the family was one of the greatest obstacles to a truly Christian life" (p. 41). "The fact is, Tolstoy required of men impossible sacrifices and his program led to complete individual and social annihilation" (p. 80). He failed because he was an individualist and not a communist. And that is the reason that we too fail as Christians, "because we have abandoned communism" (p. 115).

The author is thus in sympathy with the spirit which Tolstoy displayed, and the purpose which he had in view, but differs from him regarding the methods by which that purpose may be accomplished. Tolstoy would establish the Kingdom of God on earth by the development of the individual; the author, by establishing a communistic society.

The conclusion of the whole matter is that "beyond dispute Jesus Christ was a communist; and that communism was the material basis upon which he built his Kingdom of God" (p. 115). And the essential fallacy of the book lies in the assumption that the Kingdom of God has a material basis. Sin, redemption, atonement, find no place in the teaching. Man is to be redeemed by instituting a new social order. How that order is to be established and maintained until the hearts of men have been renewed does not appear. Christianity is an ethical code, not a gospel. "If Jesus had never spoken anything but the Sermon on the Mount, Christianity would have lost little and Jesus would still be recognized as the greatest of all religious teachers" (p. 98). But the world needs primarily not a teacher but a Savior, and the Savior is nowhere seen. Jesus came not to save men from their sins, but to set up a new social and economic system, "To work out some such material basis for Christianity is the chief problem of humanity, and its solution will mean the salvation of mankind" (p. 81). Men are to be saved by a change of circumstances and not by a change of heart. There is no place in this teaching for the cross, no room for

the gospel of divine grace. There is much in the volume that commands our sympathy, the hatred of injustice and oppression, the love of mankind, the plea for closer conformity to the teaching of Christ in our social and industrial relationships; but the remedy proposed is utterly inadequate, even if it could be thoroughly applied. Social changes will not make better men; and if such a communistic society as is here proposed should be established it would have no power to eradicate selfishness and sin, and could not be maintained. There is no short and easy method of attaining the new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. The divine method is the regeneration of the individual soul through the power of the Spirit of God.

There are statements here and there to which exception may be taken: that the Roman law is "the course of our legality" (p. 168); that Mary the mother of Jesus and Elizabeth the mother of John the Baptist "entertained strongly revolutionary views" in a political and social sense (p. 83); that the Epistle of Barnabas was written by the friend and companion of Paul (p. 130).

Princeton.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

The Productive Beliefs. By LYNN HAROLD HOUGH, D.D., President Northwestern University. Fleming H. Revell Co. 1919. Pp. 223. Price \$1.25 net.

This is the latest volume in the series of Cole lectures delivered before Vanderbilt University. The thought of the opening lecture, "The Adventurous God," is worked out in a very interesting and striking way, but neither title nor treatment carries conviction. The answer to the objection based upon God's foreknowledge is far from adequate or satisfactory. What shall we make of this—"and in the very nature of the case his (God's) knowledge of the future is an ethical thing full of the adventure of faith. Just as Jesus' knowledge of His own person and of His mission was the constant adventure of a daring faith, so God's knowledge of the future is not a hard and a mechanical thing. It is the perpetual adventure of His whole life reaching out in the faith which is the expression of His character to grasp the future. In other words there is always a splendid element of risk even in foreknowledge. . . . If it is true that man is justified by faith it is also true that in this profound and wonderful sense God is justified by faith" (p. 33)? If the passage conveys any intelligible meaning, it seems to break down the distinction between knowledge and faith, and make one only a form of the other. As there is nothing surprising or unexpected to God, the word adventurous can in no sense be applied to him who sees the end from the beginning. God runs no risks, and has no adventures.

But on the other hand the thought is brought out with clearness and power that God is not impassive, that he sorrows and suffers with men in their troubles and their sins. And this is a thought of high import, and lies at the heart of the Scripture representation of God.

The relation between belief and conduct is admirably expressed. "In the last analysis the only way to keep Christian morals is to keep the Christian God" (p. 23). The lecture on the Vital Meaning of the Cross is of special interest and value. "Calvary transforms God from a remote and dim ethical and spiritual splendor into a present and mastering and potent reality when you come to understand that it is God Himself you meet upon the Cross" (p. 137). It is distinctly unpleasant to read of Jesus that during his temptation in the wilderness "He stood quivering on the edge of the complete disruption of his faculties in an anarchy of mad nerves" (p. 92).

Dr. Hough has given us a volume of marked ability and interest. The main teaching of it may be summed up in the words of the closing lecture:—"Only a God who can speak from experience can speak to experience. . . . A God whose own life is rich in social meaning, a God whose nature is perfect love and white and flaming righteousness, a God whose experience is full of audacious and daring adventure, a God who presses close to every life in His immanent activity, and came under the full burden of life in an actual human experience in the Incarnation, a God who went the whole terrible suffering length of Calvary that men might be rescued and a new life be made possible for the world, such a God speaks to us in a language we can understand and in a voice which masters our very hearts. We can pray to such a God for He knows our language and He knows our life. We can give ourselves to such a God for He calls to us from His own way of daring adventure and He speaks to us from His own hill of pain" (pp. 220-221).

The style is clear and strong, rising at times to eloquence; but now and then we crave a greater simplicity of speech, and less exuberance of words.

Princeton.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

New Thoughts on an Old Book. By WILLIAM A. BROWN. New York:

The Abingdon Press. Cloth. 16 mo. pp. 151. Price \$1.00 net.

The book to which the author refers is none other than the Bible, in reference to which a series of interesting and familiar facts are stated; the "new thoughts", the statements relative to the truth that the Bible is distinctively a missionary book. This fact is demonstrated in each successive chapter. The conclusion which is reached and which is stated again and again is in the following words: "If it had not been for the missionary enterprise the world would never have had a Bible at all." In very briefest form the author intimates that every book in the New Testament was written by a foreign missionary. Its Epistles were written to missionary churches or to missionary workers. The problems of the early Church were missionary problems and it is to the missionary enterprise that we are indebted for the New Testament.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

The Presbyterian Handbook. Edited by the REV. WILLIAM H. ROBERTS, D.D., Stated Clerk of the General Assembly. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work. Paper. 24 mo. Pp. 128. Price 5 cents net, \$4.50 per one hundred copies.

This invaluable little handbook contains facts respecting the history, statistics and work of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., together with a list of the International Sunday School Lessons with the Home Readings for Daily Use, and includes also the weekly prayer meeting topics. This little book is indispensable to pastors, and should be secured by all members of the Presbyterian Church.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

The Man God Tried to Kill. By WILLIAM E. BIEDERWOLF. Chicago: The Glad Tidings Publishing Co. Boards. 24 mo. Pp. 175.

These "talks" on the "Deeper Life" were delivered by Dr. Biederwolf on "Indian Mound" at the Winona Lake Bible Conferences, during ten succeeding summers. They are pointed and searching, clear and appealing. They are intended to result in more definite consecration. They insist on complete surrender to the will of God, and upon the purity of life which is a necessary condition of peace and power. They promise divine pardon and strength and grace. It is not surprising to learn of the deep impression they have made upon the large groups of hearers before whom they have been delivered.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

The American Jewish Year Book, 5680. Edited by HARRY SCHNEIDERMAN for the American Jewish Committee. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America. 12 mo. Pp. 894. Price \$3.00.

This comprehensive handbook contains statistics and other items of interest relative to the Jews of America. Among its "special articles" are several which relate to the participation of the Jews in the world war. It contains directories of national organizations, of local organizations, and of Jewish Federated Charities. It includes lists of Jewish periodicals appearing in the United States, of Jewish members of Congress and the "Twelfth Annual Report of the American Jewish Committee," together with statistics of the Jewish population of Canada, of the United States and of the world.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

The Ministry of the Word. By G. CAMPBELL MORGAN, D.D. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. Cloth. 12 mo. Pp. 220. Price \$1.50.

This volume contains the James Sprunt Lectures, delivered at Union Theological Seminary in Virginia during the last Seminary year. The title is taken from the familiar phrase found in the sixth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and as interpreted by the author contains the theme with which the lectures are concerned. There is first of all a

statement of "the fundamental conceptions" embodies in the terms "Ministry" and "Word"; next "The Primitive Ideal" of the ministry of the Word is set forth, and lastly "The Modern Application" of this ideal is made in view of "The Changed Conditions" and "The Unchanged Obligation." In considering the primitive ideal this is found embodied in the terms which are quoted from the fourth chapter of the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians: "He gave some to be apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers." The rather minute study of these terms suggests the question, how far the primary and root meaning of a word is its real meaning, and whether, for instance, the term "prophet" has the exact significance in the New Testament as it has in the Old. However, the study clearly reveals the high conception of the ministerial office which was held in the Apostolic Church and the dignity of its functions as emphasized by the author of these lectures. In "The Modern Application" of this ideal Dr. Morgan adds a chapter on "The Preparation of the Ministry" and one on "The Exercise of the Vocation." The latter includes wise admonitions relative to the prayerful culture of the spiritual life, the persistent study of the Word, the practice of purposeful preaching and the patient shepherding of the flock.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

How I Tell the Bible Stories to My Sunday School. By M. REU, D.D., Professor of Theology at Wartburg Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa. Chicago: Wartburg Publishing House. 2 vols. Cloth. 12 mo. Pp. 473, 485. Price \$1.50 per volume.

As the title clearly indicates, the author is here suggesting helpful interpretations of Bible stories to be used in the Sunday Schools of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. The first volume follows the lessons outlined for those Sunday Schools "From Advent to Pentecost" and "After Trinity." In the second volume the stories cover the lessons for the "Festival Cycle" and for the "Trinity Cycle."

Each of these volumes contains sixty-nine narratives which together cover almost the entire field of Biblical History. The stories are simply but fully rehearsed and show an unquestioning loyalty to the very letter of the inspired Word.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

How to Teach in Sunday School. By THEODORE E. SCHMAUK, Professor of Pedagogy in the Theological Seminary of the United Lutheran Church, at Philadelphia and Editor of the Graded Lutheran Sunday School Series. Published by the Board of Publication of the United Lutheran Church of America, 1920.

This Teacher Training Handbook is the result of twenty-five years of Sunday school experience in various phases and gives evidence of the many-sided interests of its author along the lines of Christian pedagogy. The book is very readable. It is clear and succinct from start to finish and sticks to the point. Evangelical throughout it is positive and wholesome. Teachers of Training Classes in other de-

nominations and using different textbooks will be greatly enriched by a careful study of it alongside the lessons they are teaching. This is particularly true of Dr. Schmauk's treatment of *The Question*. The reviewer has not come across any *Teacher Training Textbook* that has dealt with this subject so exhaustively.

It may be said that the *Question* treatment forms the center of this handbook and its laws really form the laws of teaching. They are given as, Mastery, Momentum, Luminousness, Vitality, Accuracy, Sustained Interest, Personal Application. For this part alone the book seems worth securing.

There is a strong handling also of Lesson Preparation and Presentation. The author knows the Sunday School from center to circumference, its drawbacks, its molli-coddle methods, the indifference of parents, the lackadaisicalness of many teachers, and also the keenness and heartiness of pupils that may be won by the right teacher. The practical aim of Christian teaching is never lost from sight, "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." In this he goes far beyond the usual tendencies of his denomination with whom the Socratic fancy that knowledge and virtue are identical has seemed acceptable.

Two important parts of Christian teaching fare less liberally. Memory work is made a very minor subdivision of the *Question* method. This is due, probably, to the use of it chiefly in the catechetical instruction which is apart from the Sunday School. The up-to-date Sunday School does considerable memory work in its Junior Department and some in the Primary. The other important subject treated slightly is the Use of the Illustration. This ought, together with the Story which it really includes, to receive equal attention with the *Question*, because it forms as leading a part in Christian teaching. But the story receives no mention, while the Illustration is dealt with only negatively. It should not be incongruous, pointless, obscure and weakening, neutralizing, defeating itself by a twist the pupils may turn, or used too often. By way of contrast this might cover the case rather fully. In the setting forth of Herbart's five steps in teaching, the use of the illustration is made the possible substitute of Association, the third or central step.

Several pages are devoted to the importance of the Church Year, which should form a "controlling feature" in the planning of the curriculum. This custom of the Lutheran church has been considered to some extent in other denominations; but unless the dates of special church days are the same every year as is the case with Christmas, the difficulties prove too great for the meager results.

The fourfold outline of the book, containing *The Art*, *The Method*, *The Material*, and *The Act*, of teaching is systematic and well carried out. Within these four divisions the twenty-two chapters are not so well divided. The leader of a Training Class should be in a position to

assign a lesson as offered in the textbook. This might prove disastrous, however, when one chapter contains seventeen pages and another four.

Outlines follow each chapter to facilitate the work of teacher and pupil.

Oak Park, Ill.

GERRIT VERKUYL.

A Real Boy Scout. By WALTER W. MOORE, D.D., LL.D., President of Union Theological Seminary in Virginia. Richmond, Va., Presbyterian Committee of Publication. Paper. Pp. 53. 12 mo. Price 35c.

President Moore has a fascinating way of relating the stories of Old Testament History. It is a field in which he is an authority and in the art of story telling he is a master. The "Boy Scout" whose history he here relates is better known to us as Ahimaaz, and his faithful and loyal service to David the king is here set forth instructively and with great charm.

The House of Judah. By CHARLES EDWARD HEWITT. New York: The Abingdon Press. Cloth, illustrated. 12 mo. Pp. 224. \$1.00 net.

This Oriental love story relates the imaginary experiences of some of the first followers of Christ. It depicts scenes in the early days of the Church and suggests a reverent view of the miracles, the resurrection and the divine person of our Lord.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

Freedom and Advance. By REV. OSCAR L. JOSEPH. The Macmillan Co: New York. Price \$1.75.

This is a series of essays on the general social and church problems which are much discussed today. The author has read widely (about 150 books are listed at the close from which quotations are made), but too much of his reading would seem to have been in the large number of semi-mediocre works which flood the world. And one might fairly add that while he has read widely, he does not seem to have thought deeply. The book is far too much a re-statement of other's opinions, not at all in a plagiaristic sense, but as evidencing too little original work by the author. The standpoint is that of moderate liberalism,—with about the same degree of inconsistency which pervades most attempts to hold this position. "Advance" is treated as dependent on the gaining of a certain degree of "Freedom" from old, out-of-date opinions. But the consistent mediation between old and new opinions has not been worked out very thoughtfully. Yet the book contains many stimulating, helpful thoughts and will certainly give the general trend of opinion in the school of moderate liberalism to any who are not aware of its positions. The sub-title, "Discussions of Christian Progress" indicates very well its subject..

Fulton, Mo.

DANIEL S. GAGE.

What The War Has Taught Us. By CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, D.D.
The Fleming H. Revell Co.: New York and Chicago. Price \$1.50.

The theme of this book is quite sufficiently indicated by the title. It is characterized by the same over-statement of religious conditions before the war and its effect upon both soldiers and those at home, which has marked the great majority of such attempts. Balanced statements, judicious investigation, cautious and prudent conclusions have been rather conspicuously absent from the most of them. Prophecies as to what the returning soldiers would do to the Churches, to society in general, etc., were loudly made,—their prophets apparently forgetting that it would not be long till their assertions would be put to the test. And all have been shown to be extreme. The soldier boys have made no effort to revolutionize things. They have come home, resumed their old place, just about the same as when they left. This work would force one, if he accepted all its statements just as they are made, to believe that the world was about ready for doom, the Church a desperate failure, and that the War has saved both, and has resulted or will result, in a wholly new order. Neither position is accurate, both are over-strained. Still, it has many good passages, many fine thoughts.

Fulton, Mo.

DANIEL S. GAGE.

The Powers and Aims of Western Democracy. By WILLIAM MILLIGAN SLOANE, L.H.D., LL.D., Member of the American Academy of Arts and Letters. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1919. 8vo. Pp. xiii, 489.

"Whether or not we have the correct designation of the world war of 1914-18 when we style it the Great War remains to be seen. Great in moral purpose and physical measurements, beyond a doubt. But great in results? This is still uncertain, and it seems imperative that history should examine its goods, taking stock of what it must retain and of what it is equally bound to work off on the bargain counter or to discard." The book under review is "an essay in this direction." Its purpose is "to trace democracy from its sources, and the history of the democratic nation from its beginnings, to know what peace means and the conditions of peace, as the necessary preliminaries in any honest effort to reform existing political and moral defects."

This purpose is admirably fulfilled. Indeed, Dr. Sloane's work is remarkable in several respects.

1. Though practical and at all points in touch with life, it is written out of erudition which appears to have no bottom. That is to say, the author, no matter what he may be discussing, makes on the lay reader, such as the reviewer, the impression of not having touched his reserves of ore. This is unusual in the case of any writer, on any subject; it is, perhaps, specially unusual in the case of the political writers of our day; and it gives to Dr. Sloane's conclusions a value which is almost unique.

2. Though abounding in details concisely expressed, our author never loses himself in the mazes of his subject. Like Herder in the mass of material accumulated, he is unlike him in that he is never crushed or even burdened by it. So keen is his discernment of distinctions, so just is his appreciation of the difference between the economic and the political and the social, and that between the legal and the moral and the religious, that his conclusions in these spheres stand out with clearness that amounts to self-evidence.

3. Though an invincible optimist, he is far from blind to evil. He writes to expose and to correct the tremendous evils that he perceives not only on our horizon, but at our gates. The dangers inherent in and threatening our democracy he sets forth with sharpness and fidelity which leaves nothing to be desired. The almost universal and apparently irresistible trend toward socialism he combats with energy which revives our hope of success.

4. Though destructive in the sense that he is always on the lookout for the immoral and the illegal, Dr. Sloane is constructive in his political theory. Indeed, his "Evolution of the Modern Nation" is a contribution to political history as positive and noble in its sphere as is Mulford's great work on "The Nation" in the sphere of political philosophy.

5. Though always an historian rather than a philosopher and an historian of politics rather than of theology or of religion, our author reveals on every page that a definite philosophy underlies his history, and that this philosophy is theistic and Christian and Calvinistic. To the reviewer at any rate this would seem to be neither his least nor least valuable characteristic.

6. A more timely book than the one thus briefly noticed there could not be. It should be read and studied by every patriot, by every lover of mankind, particularly today. Yet though so timely, it is not timely only. As one reads it he is impressed by qualities other than those which constitute timeliness, qualities which now and then suggest that great history of the Peloponnesian War which was written to be, and which has become, *κρῆμα ἐς αἰί*.

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

American Church Monthly, New Brunswick, April: G. C. RAWLINSON, Present Position of Spiritualism; BERNARD I. BELL, A Renewal of Faith; FREDERICK B. HODGKINS, The Interchurch World Movement; WILLIAM W. DAVIS, The Concordat and After; FLEMING JAMES, The Second Epistle to Corinthians. *The Same*, May: ARTHUR C. A. HALL, Shall We Dispense with Confirmation?; C. W. ARESON, The Church in Soviet Russia; FRANK H. HALLOCK, The Gift of Understanding; F. C. H. WENDELL, Ecclesiastical Authority of the Congregationalists. *The Same*, June: FRANCIS J. HALL, Bishop Kinsman's "Salve Mater";

JOHN H. YATES, Americanization and European Culture; CLARENCE A. MANNING, Russia and Antichrist.

American Journal of Theology, Chicago, April: IRVING P. JOHNSON, Policy of the Episcopal Church; JAMES B. PRATT, Can Theology be Made an Empirical Science?; GERALD B. SMITH, Religious Significance of the Humanity of Jesus; THEOPHILE J. MEEK, Proposed Reconstruction of Early Hebrew History; S. G. HEFELBOWER, Deism Historically Defined; PETER G. MODE, Aims and Methods of Contemporary Church-Union Movements in America; MATTHEW A. POWER, Nisan Fourteenth and Fifteenth in Gospel and Talmud; CLAYTON R. BOWEN, Are Paul's Prison Letters from Ephesus?

Anglican Theological Review, Lancaster, March: LAIRD W. SNELL, "Creative Evolution" and the Christian Faith; W. F. WHITMAN, The Social Character of Christian Mysticism; THEODORE B. FOSTER, A Bibliography of Dogmatics. *The Same*, May: SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, New Turning Point in the Study of Creation; BURTON S. EASTON, Apostolic Doctrine of the Church; LEFFERD M. A. HAUGHWOUT, Steps in the Organization of the Early Church; LESTER BRADNER, The Kingdom and the Child.

Bibliotheca Sacra, Oberlin, April: WILLIAM M. MCPHEETERS, Some Strictures on Current Conceptions of Biblical Criticism; EDWARD N. HARRIS, The Conservation of a Race as a Missionary By-Product; WILLIAM H. WALKER, The Atonement in Christian Consciousness; FRANZ M. TH. BOEHL, Position of Women in Ancient Babylonia and Israel (ii); J. J. LIAS, The Evidence of Fulfilled Prophecy (ii); E. C. GORDON, The Rediscovery of Christianity.

Catholic Historical Review, Washington, April: PETER GUILDAY, The American Catholic Historical Association; V. F. O'DANIEL, A Long Misunderstood Episode in American History; CHARLES E. CHAPMAN, The Jesuits in Baja California (1697-1768); L. OLIGER, Earliest Record on the Franciscan Missions in America; V. F. O'DANIEL, Some Letters of Fathers Badin and Nerinckx to Bishop Carroll.

Church Quarterly Review, London, April: YNGVE BRILIOTH, Church of Sweden in its Relations to the Anglican Church; H. RASHDALL, Personality in Recent Philosophy; A. A. COOK, A Mediaeval Mystic's 'Fiery Soliloquy with God'; EDWARD B. COOK, The National Assembly of the Church of England; ARTHUR C. S. HEADLAM, Reunion and Theories of the Ministry; The Future of the Turkish Empire.

Constructive Quarterly, New York, March: HAROLD HAMILTON, The Organ of the Christian Unity; F. R. TENNANT, Questions Preliminary to Critical Reconstruction in Theology; SHAILER MATHEWS, The Deity of Christ and Social Reconstruction; FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL, The Church and Society; NEWMAN SMYTH, A Proposed Approach towards Unity in the United States; A. M. BROUWER, Missions as a Center of Co-operation and Union in the Netherlands; SHERWOOD EDDY, Church Union in the Orient; J. W. BUCKHAM, Heralds of a United Church. *The Same*, June: A. S. LLOYD, The Church the Living Witness of the Incarnation of the Word of God; H. L. STEWART, Wilfrid Ward's Re-

conciling Attitude; LEONID TURKEVICH, Unity in Christ; ADOLF DEISSMANN, German Theology and the Unity of the Church; ARTHUR J. BROWN, Organic Union—Why not Now?; F. R. TENNANT, The Present Condition of the Doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity; G. VAN DER LEEUW, Process and Drama; C. R. DAVEY BIGGS, The English Bishops and the Free Churches; FRANK EAKIN, Individualism in Present-Day Theology; F. J. FOAKES JACKSON, Forty Years of Cambridge Theology.

East & West, London, April: R. F. SHERWOOD, A Christian Regiment in France; R. F. BIGG-WITHER, Serbian and Bulgarian Churches; H. F. LECHMERE TAYLOR, Some recent Criticisms of Indian Missions; G. E. PHILLIPS, Contribution of Christianity to the New India; A. DARBY, Caste and Its Future; A. G. FRASER, Christianity and Taboos.

Expositor, London, April: CHRISTOPHER N. JOHNSON, Silence of St. Paul; R. MACKINTOSH, Historic Protestantism and the Penal Scheme; J. W. FALCONER, Aramaic Source of Acts 1:15 and Paul's Conversion; J. A. ROBERTSON, Jesus' Words Regarding Care; HERBERT G. WOOD, Moral Scepticism of To-Day; W. MEIKLE, The Vocabulary of "Patience" in the New Testament; E. H. ASKWITH, Some Obscure Passages in the Psalms. *The Same*, May: R. A. FALCONER, The Mystery of Godliness; RENDEL HARRIS, The Original Title of the Gospel of Mark; J. A. ROBERTSON, The "Presence" of Jesus; JOHN A. HUTTON, The "Presence" of Jesus; JOHN A. HUTTON, The Epistle General of Jude; R. MACKINTOSH, Grotianism and its Echoes; J. H. LECKIE, Beauties of Apocalyptic Literature. *The Same*, June: CUTHBERT LATTEY, The Divine Julius; FRANK GRANGER, Jesus the Workman; G. BUCHANAN GRAY, The Additions in the Ancient Greek Version of Job; T. A. GURNEY, St. Paul the Co-operator; R. MACKINTOSH, R. W. Dale and the Fact of the Atonement; J. A. ROBERTSON, Jesus and Nathaniel.

Expository Times, Edinburgh, April: HUGH R. MACKINTOSH, The Practice of the Spiritual Life; S. H. LANGDON, The Habiru and the Hebrews; H. W. FULFORD, St. Paul and Euripides. *The Same*, May: WILLIAM FULTON, the Gospel of Power; A. R. S. KENNEDY, The Samaritans; JOHN DOUGLAS, The Neglected Interpreter. *The Same*, June: F. HERBERT STEAD, A Labour View of Christianity; J. M. E. ROSS, The Disciplined Life; GEORGE MILLIGAN, The Grammar of the Greek New Testament; W. F. HOWARD, Henry Scott.

Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge, April: WILLARD L. SPERRY, The Double Loyalty of the Christian Ministry; GEORGE H. PALMER, The Lord's Prayer; JAMES BLAISDELL, The Authorship of the "We" Sections of the Book of Acts; GIORGIO LA PIANA, The Roman Church and Modern Italian Democracy.

Homiletic Review, New York, April: C. A. BECKWITH, The Idea of God in Recent Literature; GEORGE L. PARKER, Chautauqua—A Pulpit of the People; The Pest of Newness. *The Same*, May: ARCHIBALD MONTGOMERY, The Rivers of God; W. M. LANGDON, The Peculiar Case of Stanley Dodd & Co. vs. James King; F. W. BUTLER, The Christian Idea of God and Recent Philosophy; A. H. STEWART, Spirit of Stoic-

ism; J. IRWIN BROWN, *The Pilgrim Fathers in Holland. The Same*, June; LAUCHLAN M. WATT, *British Poets and the War*; EDWARD H. EPPENS, Maurice Maeterlinck; REED T. BAYNE, Maeterlinck's "Betrothal"; HARLAN P. BEACH, *What America is Doing in India*.

International Journal of Ethics, Concord, April: J. E. TURNER, *The Genesis and Freedom of Will and Action*; GEORGE B. KRACHT, *Fundamental Issue Between Nationalism and Internationalism*; VICTOR S. YARROS, *Bolshevism—its Rise, Decline and—Fall?*; EDWARD A. ROSS, *Commercialization—Increasing or Decreasing?*; THOMAS D. ELIOT, *Some Future Issues of the Sex Problem*; BENOY K. SARKAR, *The Theory of Property, Law and Social Order in Hindu Political Philosophy*; C. J. BUSHNELL, *The Community Center as a Moral Force*.

Interpreter, London, April: J. F. BETHUNE-BAKER, *The Coming of the Son of Man*; S. P. T. PRIDEAUX, *Democracy and the Idea of God*; W. EMERY BARNES, *The Task of the Prophets*; EMMA M. CAILLARD, *Spirit and Flesh*; SPENCER H. ELLIOTT, *Christian Unity and the Apostolical Succession*; WALFORD DEAKIN, *Mr. H. G. Wells Pierces a Road*; ALBERT G. BELDEN, *The Resurrection of the Body*; T. F. ROYDS, *Charity or Love?*

Irish Theological Quarterly, Dublin, April: W. MORAN, *Social Reconstruction in an Irish State*; GARRETT PIERSE, *Our Lord's Experimental Knowledge*; EDWARD KISSANE, *Historical Value of Esdras i-iii*; M. J. O'DONNELL, *Sociology, Health Bill and Eugenics*.

Journal of Negro History, Washington, April: HENRY S. WILLIAMS, *Development of the Negro Public School System in Missouri*; DAVID H. SIMS, *Religious Education in Negro Colleges and Universities*; JOHN W. CROMWELL, *The Aftermath of Nat Turner's Insurrection*.

Journal of Theological Studies, London, April: C. H. TURNER, *The Shepherd of Hermas and the Problem of the Text*; E. C. HOSKYNs, *Genesis i-iii and St. John's Gospel*; R. H. CONNOLLY, *Liturgical Prayers of Intercession. i. The Good Friday Orationes Solemnnes*; F. C. BURKITT, *Note on the Table of Nations (Genesis 10)*; R. A. AYTOUN, *'Himself He Cannot Save' (Ps. 22:29 and Mark 15:31)*; V. BURCH, *Material for the Interpretation of the Ascensio Isaiae*; A. J. MASON, *Marcarius of Egypt*.

London Quarterly Review, London, April: W. T. DAVISON, *The Atonement and Modern Thought*; F. HERBERT STEAD, *Religion in the Labor Movement*; F. W. ORDE WARD, *The Real Values of Life*; P. T. FORSYTHE, *Does the Church Prolong the Incarnation?*; BASIL ST. CLEATHER, *A Merchant Venturer in the Time of Queen Elizabeth*; ST. NIHAL SINGH, *India's Transitional Constitution: Its Genesis and Scope*; JOHN TELFORD, *An English Apostle*.

Lutheran Church Review, Lebanon, April: THEODORE E. SCHMAUK, *The Originating Cause of American Unrest*; JACOB FRY, *The Resurrection-Thought in Lutheran Theology*; HENRY E. JACOBS, *The Christian Conception of God*; LUTHER D. REED, *Our Seminaries and the Devotional Life of the Church*; CHARLES M. JACOBS, *Miracle Stories*

and the History of Doctrine; THEODORE E. SCHMAUK, Confessional Church or People's Church.

Lutheran Quarterly, Gettysburg, April: PAUL H. KRAUSS, The State University a Challenge to the Church; MARY E. MARKLEY, Lutheran Colleges for Lutheran Women; P. S. VIG, The Bible as a Factor in Higher Education; MARION J. KLINE, The Reformation; E. E. ORTLEPP, The Resurrection in Modern Life; J. M. HANTZ, Mansell's Bampton Lectures.

Methodist Quarterly Review, Nashville, April: E. WALTER MAUNDER, The Habitability of Worlds; FRANK M. THOMAS, The Interpretation of Energy; H. WILDON CARR, The Future of Bergson's Philosophy; A. T. ROBERTSON, Broadus the Preacher; WILLIAM A. WEBB, Some College Ideals; JOHN A. FAULKNER, Ritschl and the Divinity of Christ; CLIFFORD G. THOMPSON, The Metaphysical Implications of Methodism; G. B. WINTON, The Case for a College in Mexico.

Methodist Review, New York, March-April: E. D. SOPER, James Whitford Bashford: Missionary; JOHN TELFORD, The Book that Made American Methodism; H. F. RALL, Methodism and Premillennialism; BENJAMIN G. BRAWLEY, Wycliffe and the World War; ARTHUR C. BOGGESE, The Old Testament in Longfellow's Poems; K. K. QUIMBY, The Epworth League, a Success or a Failure? *The Same*, May-June: W. A. QUAYLE, The Dead Masters of Life; EDGAR S. BRIGHTMAN, The Personalistic Method in Philosophy; HENRY H. MEYER, Present Tendencies in Religious Education; OSCAR M. BUCK, The Eleventh Hour; EDWARD HAYES, The Romance of Pastoral Work; A. T. ROBERTSON, The Minister with Honest Doubts; JULIA COOLEY, The Phantom of Death.

Monist, Chicago, April: PHILIP E. B. JOURDAIN, Elliptic Orbits and the Growth of the Third Law with Newton; —Newton's Theorems on the Attraction of Spheres; J. E. TURNER, Conservation of Values in the Universe; R. W. SELLARS, The Status of the Categories; W. O. BRIGSTOCKE, Logical Fictions. i. What we Know and How we Know it; EMILE BOUTROUX, Characteristics of Modern Philosophy; M. JOURDAIN, Leonard da Vinci.

Reformed Church Review, Lancaster, April: A. S. WEBER, Religion and Theology after the War; J. N. LE VAN, Religion and Music; CHARLES E. MEYERS, Piers the Plowman; LESTER REDDIN, Priesthood Then and Now; WM. WEBER, The New Testament Catalogues of the Apostles; E. ERNEST WAGNER, Don Quixote.

Review and Expositor, Louisville, April: PHILIP W. CRANDELL, Prophets and Cultus; E. Y. MULLINS, Recent Phases of Democracy; R. E. NEIGHBOR, The Religious Experience of Jesus Christ; W. E. HENRY, Christ's Resurrection Makes Faith Easy; GEORGE W. MCDANIEL, Communication with the Dead; A. L. VAIL, Pastoral Supply and Efficiency; J. E. DILLARD, Reciprocal Relations of Education and Missions.

Southwestern Journal of Theology, Fort Worth, April: The Need of Indoctrination; J. S. ROGERS, The Authority of Christ in the New Testament; J. W. CROWDER, Salvation by Grace; L. M. SPIES, 'Regeneration, Man's Fundamental Need; J. B. GAMBRELL, Individualism and Co-operation; W. T. CONNER, the Significance of Baptism; H. E. DANA, The Lord's Supper.

Union Seminary Review, Richmond, April: EUGENE C. CALDWELL, The Millennium; ANDREW W. BLACKWOOD, A Clinic in Homiletics; THERON H. RICE, Some Brothers in Buckram; R. C. REED, Why Two Classes of Elders; JOHN FOX, Homiletics and Spiritualism.

Yale Review, New Haven, April: CHARLES SEYMOUR, The Struggle for the Adriatic; GEORGE R. HARPER, An Anglo-American Entente; EDWARD B. REED, The Injustice of Zionism; LEIGH PAGE, Einstein's Theory of Gravitation; MATHILDE WEIL, Experiences of a Medium; WILBUR C. ABBOTT, An Accidental Victorian.

Biblica, Roma, 1:2: A. FERNÁNDEZ, La Crítica reciente y el Pentateuco; J. B. FREY, Le concept de "vie" dans l'Evangile de St. Jean (suite et fin); F. ZORELL, Notae lexicales in N. T.; A. VACCARI, Le versioni arabe dei Profeti; S. G. MERCATI, Note papirologiche.

Bilychnis, Roma, Marzo: G. A. COLONNA DI CESARÒ, La guerre europea dal punto di vista spirituale; G. FERRETTI, Le fedi, le idee e la condotta; D. PROVENZAL, Un miracolo di Dio; G. E. MEILLE, Psicologia di combattenti cristiani. *The Same*, Aprile: P. ARCARI, Atteggiamenti della pittura religiosa di Eugenio Burnand; F. MOMIGLIANO, I momenti del pensiero italiano; C. PASCAL, Superstizioni e magie nella corte neroniana; G. LUZZI, A uno studente del secolo XX è egli ancora possibile d'esser cristiano?; G. PIOLI, *L'Etica della simpatia nella Teoria dei sentimenti morali* di A. Smith.

Ciencia Tomista, Madrid, Marzo-Abril: M. BARBADO, Las ciencias auxiliares de la Psicología; FRANCISCO MARIN-SOLA, Raciocinio y progreso dogmático; PASCUAL BROCH, Santo Tomás, y la sistematización apologética; J. M. VOSTÉ, Preparación de San Pablo al Apostolado. *The Same*, Mayo-Junio: A. COLUNGA, Los vaticinios mesiánicos de Daniel; HIPÓLITO SANCHO, Las ideas penales del Maestro Domingo Soto; PEDRO N. DE MEDIO, Evolucionismo y transformismo según la ciencia; PASCUAL BROCH, Las Dominicas en los Estados Unidos.

Gereformeerd Theologisch Tijdschrift, Baarn, Februari: S. GREYDANUS, Doel van de "Handelingen der Apostolen"; T. HOEKSTRA, De inleiding en het slot van de preek. *The Same*, Maart: S. GREYDANUS, Doel van de "Handelingen der Apostelen"; G. KEIZER, Een paar brieven van wijlan Prof. S. van Velzen. *The Same*, April: J. RIDDERBOS, De Joodsche "Openbaringen"; G. KEIZER, Het Biografisch Woordenboek. *The Same*, Mei: H. W. VAN DER VAART SMIT, Nawoord op mijn artikelen over het modernisme; K. SCHILDER, De Ondergang van den Antichrist.

Recherches de Sciences Religieuses, Paris, Janvier-Mars: PAUL VIGUÈ, Quelques précisions concernant l'objet de la science acquise

du Christ; LOUIS MARIÈS, Le texte arménien de l'Evangile d'après Matthieu et Marc; MARC DUBRUEL, Hiérarchie gallicane et Religieuse exempts. Un épisode de leurs relations au xviii^e siècle: Caulet et les Jésuits (suite).

Revue Benedictine, Paris, Janvier-Avril: D. D. DEBRUYNE, L'Héritage littéraire de l'abbé Saint Valère; C. CALLENWAERT, Le Careme a Milan au temps de S. Ambrose; D. U. BERLIÈRE, Innocent III et la réorganisation des monastères bénédictins.

Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique, Toulouse, Avril: P. GALTIER, "Obéissant jusqu'à la Mort"; P. PICARD, Le retour de l'âme contemplative a la méditation méthodique; F. CAVALLERA, Les plus anciens textes ascétiques chrétiens; J. V. BAINVEL, Les écrits spirituels du P. V. Huby.

Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie, Lausanne, Novembre-Décembre: CHARLY CLERC, Histoire religieuse et critique littéraire ANTONIN CAUSSE, La législation sociale d'Israël et l'idéal patriarcal.

Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Theologiques, Paris, Janvier-Avril: FRANCOIS VIAL, L'évolutionisme et les formes présentes; GASTON Rabeau, Substance et fonction, d'après M. Ernest Cassirer; TH. MAINAGE, La préhistoire et la méthode ethnographique; R. M. MARTIN, Les idées des Robert de Melun sur le pêché originel; M. JACQUIN, Melchior Cano et la théologie moderne; P. MANDONNET, Chronologie sommaire de la vie et des écrits de saint Thomas.

Rivista Trimestrale di Studi Filosofici e Religiosi, Perugia, I: 1: A. BONUCCI, L'imperativo; E. BUONAIUTI, Conversazioni del Risorto; AD LEVI, Il pensiero filosofico di B. Varisco; E. BUONAIUTI, Immanentismo idealistico ed esperienza religiosa.

Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, Innsbruck, XL:4: JOHN B. NISIUS, Zur erklärang von 2 Kor. 3: 16ff.; C. A. KNELLER, Sacramentum Unitatis; URBAN HOLZMEISTER, Das Gleichnis vom Diebe in den Evangelien und beim hl. Paulus.

COUNTERFEIT MIRACLES

By BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918. 8vo, pp. vi, 327. Price, \$2.00 net.

"One opens this book with no especial eagerness of expectation. The title makes no very urgent appeal. It sounds remote and scholastic, and we turn to the perusal of the book as one girds himself for a task that will be laborious and probably wearisome. This impression is quickly dispelled. The reviewer has the impression that the most illuminating introduction he can give to this work will be simply to put on record his own unbounded delight in the reading of it. What is it? A thoroughgoing review of extra-biblical, religious thaumaturgy from early Christian times to the present day. . . This whole subject needed exploration by a competent student, with adequate historical apparatus and with sufficiently critical mind to sift the evidence and to undertake the careful and judicious discrimination which is the first condition of dealing with problems so varied and complex. Dr. Warfield has done his work thoroughly and well. Every minister, teacher, and intelligent Christian layman with a sense of contemporary needs and dangers should not only read the discussion but become acquainted with the literature to which reference is made."—Louis M. Sweet, in *The Biblical Review*.

THE ACTS

An Exposition By CHARLES R. ERDMAN. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1919. Crown 8vo., pp. 176. Cloth, 75 cents net.

"Professor Charles R. Erdman of Princeton has published through the Westminster Press, Philadelphia, an exposition on "The Acts" which will be welcome to every sincere student of the Scriptures. The wonderful story of rapid expansion of the Christian Church as recorded in "The Acts" is here made more vivid and vital. Professor Erdman's explanations and interpretations constitute a new revelation of this record of heroic achievement and inspired eloquence."—*The New Era Magazine*.

THE WALL AND THE GATES

By J. RITCHIE SMITH. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1919. 8vo., pp. 278. Price \$1.50 net.

"Some Sermons are edifying and some are otherwise. This book belongs emphatically in the former class. There is instruction, consolation, enthusiasm, encouragement, visions and foundations for everyone. To glance at its table of contents inspires hope; a perusal of its pages deepens faith, and to sit with it for an evening makes one feel stronger and nearer to his Master when he gets down upon his knees. There is scholarship and literature in happy combination. The Scriptures are richly interpreted and the spirituality of the book will commend it to all who love God."—*The United Presbyterian*.

STUDIES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

A Discussion of the Historical Questions. By ROBERT DICK WILSON. New York and London: G. F. Putnam's Sons; The Knickerbocker Press, 1917. 8vo, pp. xvi, 402. Price, \$3.50.

"It is difficult within a short space to give an adequate account of the way in which Professor Wilson acquits himself in the task of meeting all the objections that adroit and learned combatants have been alleging with a view to undermine faith in the historical character of Daniel and his prophecies. He seems always to take the statements of some at least of the Higher Critics almost more seriously than the critics themselves, and then institutes an inquiry about as thorough as in the nature of the case is possible, with the result that the conclusion is forced upon us that after all the Destructive Critics have mistaken their own *ipse dixit* for evidence, and baseless assumptions for the conclusions of an inductive science."—John R. Mackay, in *The Monthly Record of the Free Church of Scotland*.

ELECTION

By BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1918. 16mo, pp. 22. Price, Ten cents.

"A strong, forceful and instructive setting forth of the Scripture teaching as to this great doctrine of divine grace."—*The Herald and Presbyter*.